DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 875 CE 059 821

TITLE States and Communities on the Move: Policy Initiatives To Create a World-Class Workforce.
INSTITUTION William T. Grant Foundation, Washington, DC. Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 44p.
AVAILABLE FROM William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 301, Washington, DC 20036 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Apprenticeships; Community Programs; Community Services; Corporate Support; Demonstration Programs; Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs; Educational Finance; *Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; Futures (of Society); *Labor Force Development; *Nontraditional Education; Postsecondary Education; Public Policy; Regional Planning; Regional Programs; School Business Relationship; School Support; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; Tax Allocation; Tax Effort; Technology; Vocational Education; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Tech Prep

ABSTRACT

This report identifies promising and innovative responses to employment-related education reform. Chapter 1 is an overview of the challenge of building a world-class work force. Chapters 2-10 present 50 examples of policy initiatives in digest form, organized into nine themes; each digest provides the name of a contact. Chapter 2 discusses new planning structures for human resource investment policies in Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, New Jersey, Indiana, New York, and California. Chapter 3 reports on comprehensive school-to-employment programs in Oregon and Wisconsin and on planning councils in Vermont, Minnesota, and New York. Chapter 4 considers student apprenticeship in Arkansas, Oregon, and Pennsylvania; a regional effort; and planning grants. Chapter 5 describes the Indiana Tech Prep Curriculum Model and other state and local efforts. Chapter 6 cites statewide policies related to youth community service in Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Maryland. Chapter 7 discusses business and education partnerships in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Georgia, and Maryland. Chapter 8 describes alternative learning centers in New Jersey, Kentucky, New York, and Minnesota and examples of an innovative use of the federal Job Corps. Chapter 9 notes postsecondary initiatives in New York, Rhode Island, Michigan, Louisiana, Maryland, Washington, and Kansas. Chapter 10 reports on creative funding mechanisms in California, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Florida. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

STATES and COMMUNITIES ON THE MOVE:

Policy Initiatives to Create a World-Class Workforce

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report was prepared primarily by Lawrence N. Gold. Mr. Gold is president of Public Policy Advocates, Inc., a policy analysis firm in Washington, D.C. specializing in education and health. Mr. Gold is the author of *Campus Roadblock: How Federal Policies Make It Difficult for Adults to Go to College* and *Tuition Formulas at Work: An Examination of States That Use a Numerical Formula to Help Set Public College Tuition.* He may be contacted at Public Policy Advocates, Inc., Suite 400, 1101 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Phone: (202) 628-3616. Funding for this publication was provided by the William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship.

******

The co-publishers request the cooperation of readers in reporting errors, omissions and progress in implementation. If you want to tell us about an interesting endeavor that belongs in a publication like this, please describe it on one page in the format we have used (i.e., How did it get started? What is it doing? How is it paid for? What is known about its effects? What difficulties have been encountered and how did you deal with them? Who should be contacted for further information?) Please write to us at the address listed below.

******

This publication is not copyrighted and may be freely quoted without prior permission, provided the source is identified as *State and Communities on the Move: Policy Initiatives to Create a World-Class Workforce.* Washington, DC: William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship *et al,* 1991.

******

Additional copies of *States and Communities on the Move* are available at $5.00 each *prepaid*, to cover cost of mailing and handling. Purchase orders are acceptable. Please order from:

William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 301 Washington, DC 20036-5541

States and Communities on the Move: Policy Initiatives to Build a World-Class Workforce

Contents

Introduction		5
Chapter One	Overview: The Challenge of Building a World-Class Workforce "Workforce 2000" • "The Forgotten Half" • "America's Choice" • The Challenge for Policy Makers • The States Respond	7
Chapter Two	Coordinated Human Resource Investment Planning Bodies Oregon: A Comprehensive Strategy • Oregon Progress Board • Oregon Workforce Quality Council • Indiana: The Super-Agency Approach • New York: State Human Resource Investment Subcabinet • Massachusetts Jobs Council (MASSJOBS) • Washington Work Force Training and Education Coordinating Board • New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission • California Master Plan for Workforce Education and Skills Training	11
Chapter Three	School-to-Employment Transitions Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century • Wisconsin School to Work Initiative • Vermont Getting Ready to Work Study Commission • Minnnesota Education and Employment Transitions • New York Task Force on Creating Career Pathways for New York's Youth	17
Chapter Four	Student Apprenticeship Arkansas Youth Apprenticeship Initiative • Oregon Youth Apprenticeship Training Program • Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program • Council of Great Lakes Governors Youth Apprenticeship and School-to-Work Initiative • Council of Chief State School Officers Apprenticeship Awards	21
Chapter Five	Technical Preparation (Tech Prep) Indiana Technology Preparation Curriculum Model Program • Boeing Company and Tech Prep • Other State Tech Prep Programs • National Tech Prep Legislation	25
Chapter Six	Youth Community Service PennServe • Maryland Community Service/School-to-Employment Requirements • Minnesota Community Service • Other State Initiatives	29

Chapter Seven Employers as Active Partners in Education and Training 33
Boston Compact • The Compact Project • New York School and Business Alliance • Illinois Labor-Management Cooperation Committee • Maryland Passport to the Future • Georgia Technical Education Guarantee • Prince George's County, Maryland Guaranteed Employability Program

Chapter Eight Alternative Learning Centers 37
New Jersey School-Based Youth Services Program • Kentucky Youth Service Centers • Minnesota Area Learning Centers • New York STEP Program • New York Skills Opportunity Centers • New York Centers for Comprehensive Education and Support Services (ACCESS)/Counseling, Assessment and Support Services for Education and Training (CASSET) • Innovations in the Job Corps

Chapter Nine New Pathways to Postsecondary Education 41
New York Liberty Scholarships and Liberty Partnerships • Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education • Michigan Tuition Incentive Program • Louisiana College Tuition Assistance Plan • Maryland Educational Excellence Awards • Washington Running Start Program • Kansas Youth Education Service Program • Washington State Community Service Initiatives

Chapter Ten Creative Funding Mechanisms for Human Investment 45
California Employment Training Panel • Massachusetts Labor Shortage Initiative • Oregon Workforce Development Fund • Pinellas County, Florida Juvenile Welfare Board

Acknowledgements 47

INTRODUCTION

The United States is awakening to the dangers of complacency. Despite the insistent prod of international economic competition, the nation has allowed its competitive edge to dull and its leadership role in the world economy to falter. An expanding—even a stable —national standard of living is no longer a foregone conclusion. Individual earnings, national prosperity, social justice and domestic stability are each in question.

Americans of widely different circumstances and political persuasions now realize that far too little is being done to prepare young people to succeed in increasingly high-skill, high-performance jobs. The need to build effective links among schooling, training and the workplace has never been more urgent. The case for greater investment in the preparation of a 21st Century workforce has never been more compelling.

And the nation is beginning to respond. Not everywhere, to be sure, and not always with the degree of commitment and urgency that is required. Leaders in government, especially at the state level, in commerce and industry, in labor, and in education and training are definitely on the move, however. Their progress needs to be better recognized, understood, and more widely discussed.

In an effort to discover the extent of this recent activity, we spoke with leaders of national organizations and dozens of contacts in the states. What we found were scores of policy initiatives related to human investment planning, school-to-employment transition, and similar issues at various stages of implementation. When we started our research four months ago, many of these efforts were well underway. Others have only just begun. A few were still awaiting final legislative action; some still are.

From this wealth of information we selected over 50 examples to present here in digest form, organized into nine themes. Each initiative is described briefly, coupled with the name of a person who can be contacted for further information.

This is not another report about elementary and secondary school reform. Rather, it is about helping *all* young people make a successful transition from school to a job with a real economic future and to appropriate levels of postsecondary education. However that successful transition is carried out, it will require an education system that behaves very differently from the one in place today. School change that does not include post-high school graduation success as a major goal is no longer acceptable. Nor is tacking on additional categorical programs called "school-to-work transitions" to our present K-12 system likely to work well either. What is needed, we believe, is a thorough revamping of American schooling in which one of the key questions (but only one) is: Are we preparing our young people for the economy of the 21st Century, an economy demanding higher skill levels than ever before?

In this report, we discuss new planning structures for human investment policies; new statewide school-to-employment transition policies; student apprenticeship, "tech prep" and other experience-based learning initiatives; new "second chance" programs for dropouts; new partnerships between education and employers; new pathways to postsecondary education; and creative financing mechanisms. The breadth and innovation of the activities exhibited in these pages are exciting. While it may be too early to speak of a "fair chance" for America's non-college youth and young families, this slim volume documents that many states and communities are clearly moving in this direction.

Our view of the worth of these efforts is that taken by Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship in its studies of *The Forgotten Half:**

> "We do not know everything about what works, but there is much creative activity in the country that needs to be better understood, evaluated and adapted to local needs and preferences. We cite some programs that are not yet rigorously evaluated but do not endorse them as the best such programs available. Instead, we

**The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America* and *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Youth Families* (both 1988).

include them as interesting examples of state and local initiatives and as hopeful efforts for states, communities and employers to explore. They illustrate the kind of pragmatic policies, programs and practices that the Commission views as worthy of wider discussion around the nation."

In short, we present these policies not as the "last word"—definitive and proven effective—but, rather, as a guide to what is in fact happening around the country; as efforts of serious men and women of affairs to deal with the challenge of restoring American prosperity through the re-creation of a world-class workforce. When we cite a specific state policy or program this does not mean that another state may not have done something similar, perhaps even earlier. An exhaustive survey is not the intention of this document. We offer, instead, a rich sampling of what we have found after a diligent search with many helpers. We gratefully acknowledge their assistance at the end of this report.

Recognizing the value of concerted action and creative experimentation on behalf of youth and America's future, a broad array of national organizations have joined with the William T. Grant Foundation to co-publish and disseminate this document: **Council of Chief State School Officers, Education Commission of the States, Jobs for the Future, National Alliance of Business, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of State Directors of Vocational Technical Education, National Center on Education and the Economy, National Collaboration for Youth, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors' Association, National Youth Employment Coalition,** and **Office of Work-Based Learning-U.S. Department of Labor.**

Our collective goal is to stimulate more informed debate in legislatures and policy councils of all kinds, in the media, and wherever concerned citizens gather to meet the challenges of the future head on, with resourcefulness, energy and commitment. If this initial collection of *States and Communities on the Move* helps to clarify policy options and helps to enhance communication among the policy makers in our vast nation-continent, we shall be well rewarded.

Samuel Halperin

William T. Grant Foundation
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship

October 1991

Chapter One: Overview: The Challenge of Building a World-Class Workforce

Since the mid-1980s, the evidence has been mounting that there is something very wrong with the link between education and employment in this country. Three well-publicized studies, in particular, sharpened national concern about the need to strengthen and redirect the way we prepare students for the workplace and the way we utilize their talents once they get there.

The first of these reports, published in 1987, was *Workforce 2000*. Commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor and prepared by the Hudson Institute, *Workforce 2000* maintained that a serious mismatch was developing between the skills of the workforce and the jobs of the future.

The second research effort culminated in two reports in 1988: *The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America* and *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families*, published by the William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. *The Forgotten Half* reports the special problems faced by the nation's 20 million non-college-bound 16–24 years-olds as they try to start families and successful careers in today's troubled economy.

The third report, published in 1990 by the National Center on Education and the Economy's Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, is *America's Choice: high skills or low wages!* Follow-up presentations before leaders in government, labor and education by Commission co-chairs Ira Magaziner and former US Secretaries of Labor William E. Brock and Ray Marshall and other Commission members have kept the report's findings in the public eye and, as we will see, have spurred a good deal of interest and activity around the country.

"WORKFORCE 2000"

Workforce 2000 projected that, while the American economy was likely to continue growing, manufacturing would occupy a much smaller share of the economy, and service industries a much larger share. The fastest growing jobs would be in professional, technical and sales fields requiring the highest education and skill levels. Thus, the report predicted increasing joblessness among the least-skilled workers and decreasing joblessness among the most educationally advantaged.

While 40 percent of today's jobs are in low skill occupations, the report said that only 27 percent would fall into that category in 2000. At the same time, jobs in high skill occupations would rise from 24 percent to 41 percent of the workforce. The mean years of education required for employment was projected to rise to 13.5. Thus, some academic technical education beyond high school, if not a full four-year undergraduate education, would become essential to fill the vast majority of high wage jobs.

At the same time, the report maintained, the workforce would grow more slowly than at any time since the 1930s, and become older, more female and more disadvantaged. Nonwhites, women and immigrants would make up more than five-sixths of the net additions to the workforce between now and the year 2000. If the United States is to continue to prosper, the study concluded, policy makers must, among other things, find ways to:

—Maintain the dynamism of an aging workforce;
—Integrate women, black and Hispanic workers fully into the economy; and
—Improve the educational preparation of all workers. In terms of education, the study stated:

> "A century ago, a high school education was thought to be superfluous for factory workers and a college degree was the mark of an academic or a lawyer. Between now and the year 2000, for the first time

> in history, a majority of all new jobs will require some postsecondary education. If the economy is to grow rapidly and American companies are to reassert their world leadership, the educational standards that have been established in the nation's schools must be raised dramatically. Put simply, students must go to school longer, study more and pass more difficult tests covering more advanced subject matter. From an economic standpoint, higher standards in the schools are the equivalent of competitiveness internationally."

Virtually all of the trend data in *Workforce 2000* is subject to challenge and different interpretations. (A comprehensive critique is found in *The Myth of the Coming Labor Shortage: Jobs, Skills and Incomes of America's Workforce 2000*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 1991). However, the existence of a growing income gap between more and less educated workers is indisputable, and the influence of *Workforce 2000*, in terms of stimulating debate about educational upgrading and the education-work connection, is undeniable.

"THE FORGOTTEN HALF"

The *Forgotten Half* concept refers to the approximately 20 million 16–24 year-olds unlikely to attend any college at some time in their life. The *Forgotten Half* studies of the William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future reported that "opportunities for young workers beginning their careers with a high school diploma or less are far more constrained than were those of their peers of 15 years ago." The Commision found young workers' opportunities for "a job with a future" shrinking, while unemployment rates remained extraordinarily high, real income and home ownership declined steeply, and single-parent households increased dramatically.

While noting that the Forgotten Half are a widely diverse and often successful group of people—*not* "a generation on the skids . . . overcome by drugs, crime, teenage pregnancy and alienated from adults"—nevertheless, in today's economy, "those with less education must scramble for good jobs in a sea of part-time, low-paying, limited-future employment opportunities."

What these young people need, the study argued, is greater attention, respect and resources from government, the schools and the business community. Non-college-bound youth need policies that encourage strong families during the adolescent years and provide opportunities to participate effectively in the community, through youth service and youth leadership activities.

In terms of schooling, the study noted, "Educators have become so preoccupied with those who go on to college that they have lost sight of those who do not. And more and more of the non-college-bound now fall between the cracks when they are in school, drop out or graduate inadequately prepared for the requirements of the society and the workplace."

Among other things, the Grant Commission called for:

- —The development of more local compacts—alliances of business, education and community resources—"to set concrete and measurable standards for student achievement, to develop programs to meet them, and to reward accomplishment with career-level employment and advanced education;"
- —Government incentives to employers for job creation and training in targeted situations;
- —Increased funding for proven programs to ease the passage from school to employment, including cooperative education, career internships, student apprenticeships, monitored work experiences, youth-operated enterprises, career information and counseling and, again, community and neighborhood service and forms of experience-based learning in concert with academic, conceptual, classroom-based instruction;
- —More second-chance programs for school dropouts and young workers needing to raise their skill levels.

"AMERICA'S CHOICE"

Echoing earlier studies, *America's Choice: high skills or low wages!* began with an analysis of the economy. America's expanding economy in the 1970s and 1980s was built largely on the fact that more of the population joined the workforce and became employed (50 percent compared to 40 percent), consisting mainly of Baby Boomers come of age and more women entering the workforce. But workforce growth is slowing dramatically. The only way our standard of living can be maintained, let alone improved, is by improving the productivity of the workforce. This means businesses must be organized to promote decision making by front-line

workers, and those workers must be educated and trained sufficiently to rise to the challenge.

This is not the case today. Most American businesses utilize out-of-date, mass production techniques that make them less competitive in the world market. They do not place a high premium on educational achievement in filling front-line jobs, and they do not invest heavily in training. Only eight percent of front-line workers receive any formal training once on the job, and this is usually limited to orientations or short courses.

The schools have not set high academic standards for the non-college-bound nor have they put into place a system for assessing achievement against standards. In fact, the report says, "America may have the worst school-to-work transition system of any advanced industrial country." Although 70 percent of the jobs in the year 2000 will *not* require a four-year college education, the nation's attention has largely been focused on the less than 30 percent of our population which will complete a four-year degree. Therefore, *America's Choice* joined the chorus of analysts calling for higher levels of achievement including more and better postsecondary education, as well as much higher standards in our K-12 system.

America's Choice made five key recommendations:

1. A new educational performance standard should be set for all students, to be met by age 16. This standard should be established nationally and benchmarked to match the highest in the world.

At the completion of the tenth grade, students would take a series of performance-based examinations and be awarded a Certificate of Initial Mastery, after which students could choose among preparing for work, entering a college preparatory program, or studying for a Technical or Professional Certificate (which would typically include up to two years of postsecondary training.)

Today, *America's Choice* noted sadly, "Most employers look at the high school diploma as evidence of staying power, not of academic achievement. The vast majority of them do not even ask to see a transcript. They realized long ago that it is possible to graduate from high school in this country and still be functionally illiterate. As a result. . .the non-college-bound know that their performance in high school is likely to have little or no bearing on the type of employment they manage to find."

2. With more than 20 percent of students dropping out of high school (almost 50 percent in the inner cities), the states, with federal aid, should create alternative learning environments for those who cannot attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery in regular schools. Students would not be permitted to work before age 18 unless they had earned a Certificate of Initial Mastery or were enrolled in a program to attain it. Today, on the contrary, dropouts, who need the most help, receive the least. Where average annual expenditures per high school pupil are roughly $4,300, the total federal, state and local funding for dropout programs amounts to only $235 per dropout.

3. A comprehensive system of Technical and Professional Certificates and associate degrees should be created for the majority of students and adult workers who do not pursue a baccalaureate degree.

4. Employers should be given incentives and assistance to invest in the further education and training of their workers and to pursue high productivity forms of work organization. The goal is to have all employers invest at least one percent of their payroll for education and training or to contribute that amount to a general training fund to be used by the states to upgrade worker skills.

5. A system of Employment and Training Boards should be established by federal and state governments, together with local leadership, to organize and oversee the proposed new school-to-work transition programs and training systems. These boards would, among other things, coordinate school-to-work transition programs, youth centers, and the development and implementation of standards for Technical and Professional Certificates.

THE CHALLENGE FOR POLICY MAKERS

While approaching their subject from very different perspectives, these landmark studies all present a dramatic, urgent challenge to policy makers:

America cannot afford to waste one student. The public schools must assure that all of our students, those who will go to college as well as those who will seek employment directly after high school, meet much higher standards of achievement, standards squarely tied to the skills that workers need to make successful careers in the new high-performance workplace that the nation needs to restore its prosperity.

Opportunities for education beyond high school, both for a full college education and

for shorter-term technical education, should be encouraged in every way possible to qualify individuals for high-skill, high-wage careers and to provide incentives for high-performance work organizations.

Opportunities for high educational achievement need to be made available to youth and adults who are no longer in the school system, as well as to youth currently in school.

Government, business and education must work together more closely to set appropriate standards of achievement, to support education and training, and to provide rich opportunities for young people and front-line workers to acquire the needed skills.

THE STATES RESPOND

As has been true of so many policy areas, particularly over the last decade, many of the most serious, promising and innovative responses to employment-related education reform have been at the state and local level—among governors, legislators, state agency heads, and grassroots leaders in education, business and the nonprofit sectors.

A growing number of people in positions of responsibility around the country recognize the need to seek effective responses to the challenge of educating a world-class workforce. This concern has been bipartisan, and most of the initiatives undertaken in response to that concern have enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

The amount of activity in statehouses and schoolhouses across the nation is all the more remarkable because most of these efforts have developed in relative isolation. Vigorous outreach efforts by several organizations, including the National Center on Education and the Economy, the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Education Commission of the States, the Business Roundtable, and the National Alliance of Business, are decreasing that isolation.

The purpose of this report is to reduce that isolation further by spreading news to concerned public officials and members of the public about the nature and variety of what is being tried out today in states and communities from coast-to-coast.

The following chapters outline state and community initiatives under several headings:

Chapter Two:	Coordinated Human Resource Investment Planning Bodies
Chapter Three:	School-to-Employment Transitions
Chapter Four:	Student Apprenticeship
Chapter Five:	Technical Preparation (Tech Prep)
Chapter Six:	Youth Community Service
Chapter Seven:	Employers as Active Partners in Education and Training
Chapter Eight:	Alternative Learning Centers
Chapter Nine:	New Pathways to Postsecondary Education
Chapter Ten:	Creative Funding Mechanisms for Human Investment

Despite our attempt to bring order to the presentation, we know that the initiatives appearing in these pages reflect diverse philosophies, ages and target groups, educational levels, and implementation strategies. Some initiatives are more highly developed than others; some communities have provided more detailed information than others. What we present is a kaleidoscope, just as the nation's response to education and workforce issues is itself a vivid display—in many different designs and colors—of what is being done for America's youth and the nation's future.

We note again that the examples described herein are not put forward as rigorously evaluated, nor as necessarily more praiseworthy than other efforts. They are, simply, examples of the initiative, creativity and commitment of people around the country who are not satisfied with the status quo. We hope that this report will spark still more enthusiasm and experimentation at all levels of government and private endeavor. The need for our nation to address workforce education and youth development issues more effectively could scarcely be more urgent.

—Lawrence N. Gold

CHAPTER TWO: COORDINATED HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT PLANNING BODIES

Many states have created a new super-agency, commission or subcabinet group to develop a human investment strategy for the state in the coming decade, a strategy aimed at coordinating the activities of the state's education, training and economic development agencies. These bodies always include representatives of key state agencies and frequently involve representatives from education, business, labor, advocacy and the legislature.

These approaches differ from one another in a variety of ways:

—They differ in *the source of their authority*; for example, some are codified in law, but others, such as Indiana's, were created by executive order.

—These policy-making bodies also differ in *the scope of programs they coordinate*. Occasionally, they assume some or all of the duties of other state boards, such as the State Job Training Coordinating Council or the State Board on Vocational Technical Education.

—They differ in their *financial and staff structures*. Some have line-item appropriations and staff, others rely on funding and staff borrowed from other agencies to perform their key functions. Still others use a combination of permanent and borrowed staff.

—They differ in *the type of agency personnel participating* in major deliberations, and they also differ in their *relationships with local government entities*.

The following examples, drawn from Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, New Jersey, Indiana, New York, and California demonstrate some of this diversity. We caution again that these examples are merely instructive; many states have launched initiatives of this nature, and we are neither being prescriptive nor exhaustive in citing these particular cases.

OREGON: A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

In 1991, Oregon moved more aggressively than any other state to develop a comprehensive, coordinated response to the full array of education and workforce issues described earlier in this report, and, particularly, to those solutions recommended in *America's Choice*.

Rep. Vera Katz, former Speaker of the Oregon House and the author of major education reform legislation (see Chapter Three), is a board member of the National Center on Education and the Economy which organized the *America's Choice* effort. One of the principal authors of *America's Choice*, Ira Magaziner, addressed a special joint meeting of Oregon House and Senate members on March 20, 1991. His recommendations were then clearly reflected in the Legislature's response to the ongoing work of the Oregon Progress Board and the Oregon Workforce Quality Council (which are both cited below).

The comprehensiveness of Oregon's response to workforce development issues is also reflected in a series of 1991 initiatives cited in other sections of this report, including the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century (see Chapter Three); the Oregon Youth Apprenticeship Program (see Chapter Four); the Oregon Tech Prep program (see Chapter Five); and the Oregon Lottery (see Chapter Ten.)

OREGON PROGRESS BOARD

The Oregon Progress Board, created by the Legislature in 1989 (and continued through 1995 under HB 2249, enacted 1991) is the state's principal strategic planning body. It is responsible for recommending basic state policy goals and proposing measurable benchmarks for achieving them. The seven-member Board is chaired by the Governor and consists of leaders from Oregon's public and private sectors. The Board is supported both by general funds and dedicated funds from the state lottery.

The Board proposed its first set of Benchmarks for legislative review in January, 1991, following an

extensive series of public meetings throughout 1990. The Legislature reviewed these Benchmarks, made some changes, and then formally approved the Benchmarks (in SB 636) and charged the Board with reporting back each biennium on progress in achieving them.

Whenever possible, the Benchmarks focus on measurable outputs or results (for example, adult literacy rates) rather than inputs (e.g., the amount of money spent on literacy education.) Goals are also divided into "lead" Benchmarks, which are short-term Benchmarks related to urgent problems on which progress is required in the next five years, and "key" Benchmarks, which are fundamental, long-term measures of the state's vitality and health.

A number of Benchmarks are related to the goal of being "the best educated and trained people in America by the year 2000, and equal to any in the world by the year 2010." For example, the percentage of high school student enrollment in structured work experience programs is to rise from three percent in 1990 to 35 percent in 2000 to 55 percent in 2010.

See next page for examples of some of Oregon's Benchmarks.

For further information, contact: Duncan Wyse, Oregon Progress Board, 775 Summer Street, NE, Salem, OR 97310. Phone: (503) 373-1220.

OREGON WORKFORCE QUALITY COUNCIL

Legislation enacted in 1991 (HB 3133) created a 21-member Oregon Workforce Quality Council. The Council is charged with developing goals and a comprehensive strategy to meet the Oregon Progress Board objective of having "the best educated and prepared work-force in America by the year 2000, and a workforce equal to any in the world by 2010."

The Council will bring together representatives of the major state agencies involved in education and training, along with local officials and representatives of business, industry and labor, and will oversee:

- —Primary and secondary school reform, including higher performance standards, demonstration of mastery by all students and alternative learning centers, when this program is fully implemented;
- —Professional and technical education reform, including industry-driven programs for students wishing to pursue apprenticeships or community college technical certificates and degrees;
- —Adult training programs, including programs for existing workers, dislocated workers, the long-term unemployed and the economically disadvantaged;
- —Business, labor and education partnerships, including efforts to involve employers in designing and providing training programs and secondary and postsecondary professional and technical education; and
- —Coordination and centralization of education and training programs and employment services at both the state and local level.

Members of the Council will serve as overlapping members of other state advisory committees related to education and training. A subcommittee of the Council will assume the duties of the State Job Training Coordinating Council under the federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA.)

For further information, contact: Marilyn Johnston, Administrator, Oregon Workforce Quality Council, 225 Winter Street, Salem, OR 97310. Phone: (503) 378-3921.

INDIANA: THE SUPER-AGENCY APPROACH

In early 1990, Governor Evan Bayh appointed a panel to develop recommendations for creating a system of workforce development for Indiana citizens. As a result of this panel's work, on February 7, 1991, the Governor issued an Executive Order creating the Indiana Department of Workforce Development. This Department merged three state agencies: Department of Employment and Training Services, Commission on Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Workforce Literacy. The Indiana Department of Workforce Development is the lead agency for implementing the Governor's workforce development initiatives.

Comprehensive workforce development legislation will be introduced in the General Assembly in January, 1992. Part of the Governor's legislation will codify the Executive Order establishing the Department of Workforce Development. The proposed legislation will also include a Workforce Development Board of Directors with broad decisionmaking authority and a Steering Committee to advise workforce development planning strategies. The Steering Committee is comparable to what other states are calling a Human Resource Investment Council.

Lead Benchmarks for Quality of Life	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Air Quality. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards	33%	30%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Affordable Housing. Percentage of Oregon households below median income spending less than 30 percent of their household income on housing (including utilities)		53%		75%	90%	90%
Urban Mobility. Percentage of Oregonians who commute to and from work during peak hours by means other than a single occupancy vehicle			29%	40%	50%	60%
Health Care Access. Percentage of Oregonians with economic access to basic health care			84%	90%	100%	100%
Rural Health Care. Percentage of Oregonians living in geographic areas with access to basic health care			94%	96%	98%	99%

Lead Benchmarks for the Economy	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Workers' Compensation Costs. Oregon's national ranking in workers' compensation costs			8th	20th-25th	20th-25th	20th-25th
Value Added Wood Products. Percentage of lumber and wood products manufacturing employees in "value-added" manufacturing		19%	28%	39%	45%	50%
Developable Industrial Land. Acreage of industrial sites identified in comprehensive plans that are actually suitable for development				75%	100%	100%
Tax Burden. Total taxes per capita as percentage of U.S. average			90%	90-100%	90-100%	90-100%
Public Infrastructure Investment. Capital outlay for public facilities as a percentage of gross state product	3.0%	3.0%	2.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%

From *Oregon Benchmarks: Setting Measurable Standards for Progress. Report to 1991 Legislature*. Oregon Progress Board, January 1990.

Key Benchmarks
(Fundamental, Enduring Measures of Oregon's Well Being)

Key Benchmarks for People	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Adult Health. Percentage of adults with good health practices			46%	52%	60%	75%
Basic Student Skills. Percentage of 11th grade students who achieve basic skill mastery						
Comparative Math Skills. Ranking of 12th grade students on international math assessment			12th of 15*			1st
Adult Literacy. Percentage of adults proficient at prose, document, and quantitative literacy skills			35%*			65%

Key Benchmarks for Quality of Life	1970	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
Air Quality. Percentage of Oregonians living where the air meets government ambient air quality standards	33%	30%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Natural Resource Lands. Percentage of Oregon agricultural lands, forest lands, and wetlands in 1990 still preserved for those uses			100%	100%	99%	99%
Groundwater. Quantity of Oregon groundwater.						
Affordable Housing. Ratio of the price of a home that a median income Oregon household can afford to the median price of Oregon homes for sale				>1.2:1	>1.2:1	>1.2:1
Crime. Overall crimes per 1,000 Oregonians per year		138	144	100	65	50

* These are rankings of the U.S. as a whole. Although Oregon is close to these norms, the state is developing current, specific data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Governor's reform program will address: Mastery of Basic Skills Certificates; expansion of science and math advanced placement programs; workforce proficiency standards and curriculum; the development of Workforce Development Centers in each employment office to provide uniform assessments; information on training, retraining, employment and career opportunities; and referral services.

For further information, contact: Doug Roof, Director, Policy and Planning, Indiana Department of Workforce Development, Indiana Government Center South, Room E204, 10 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2277. Phone: (317) 232-1898.

NEW YORK: STATE HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT SUBCABINET

In January, 1990, the New York State Job Training Partnership Council published "Creating a Vision: the Workforce Preparation System of the Future." In it the Council recommended the establishment of a Human Resource Investment Subcabinet made up of representatives of the State Job Training Partnership Council, the New York State Departments of Education, Social Services, Labor, Economic Development, the State and City Universities of New York, the Divisions For Youth and Human Rights, and the Higher Education Services Corporation.

The Subcabinet was created with a major goal the planning and implementation of the Gateway Initiative. Under Gateway, New York is piloting the idea of developing an integrated human resource investment system in four test sites within the state. Interagency teams of state and local policy makers and administrators are developing joint strategies to address all clients' education, training and support service needs. At the local level, each participating agency or affiliate is to act as a customer service center giving clients information about all the programs, services and job vacancies throughout the system. On the basis of the recommendations developed by the interagency teams working with the test sites, the Subcabinet will expand the system across the state.

A second project of the Human Resource Investment Subcabinet is described in Chapter Three. The New York Task Force on Creating Career Pathways for New York Youth is developing recommendations for creating more effective school to work transition programs. These recommendations will then be submitted to the Subcabinet for coordination.

For further information, contact: Michael Vitagliano, Job Training Partnership Council, P.O. Box 7015, Alfred E. Smith Office Building, 17th Floor, Albany, NY 12225. Phone: (518) 474-6014.

MASSACHUSETTS JOBS COUNCIL (MASSJOBS)

Widely considered a significant innovation at the time of its establishment in 1988, the Massachusetts Jobs (MASSJOBS) Council was established as the policy making and coordinating body for all employment and training programs in Massachusetts. The Council was reauthorized and strengthened by the Legislature in 1991 (Section 46, Chapter 145, Acts of 1991).

Council members divide almost equally among officials of the relevant state agencies (e.g., economic development, employment training, education), private sector representatives, and representatives of providers and clients. A subset of the Council serves as the State JTPA Job Coordinating Council.

MASSJOBS has enabled state officials to begin to set consistent strategies for workforce development and to establish statewide priorities for employment-related education and training. Its work is supplemented by a network of Regional Employment Boards. The Boards adapt statewide priorities to regional areas, develop regional training and employment-related education plans, and review, recommend and approve local provider plans.

The regional boards also serve as JTPA Private Industry Councils. According to a 1990 report prepared by the Northwest Policy Center of the University of Washington, the regional boards are "the essential mechanism for transforming state level mission and policy statements into programs which are reflective of and responsive to local needs."

For further information, contact: Judith Gilbert, Policy, Planning and Legislative Affairs, Department of Employment and Training, 4th Floor Charles F. Hurley Building, 19 Stanford Street, Boston, MA 02114. Phone: (617) 727-1826.

WASHINGTON WORK FORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

The State of Washington enacted legislation in 1991 (Senate Bill 5184) creating the 11-member

Work Force Training and Education Coordinating Board to provide "planning, coordination, evaluation, monitoring and policy analysis" for education and training programs offered by a variety of state agencies, including the community colleges, technical colleges, adult literacy programs, and Job Training Partnership Act programs.

The new Board is to have overlapping membership with other state planning boards, including the State Job Training Coordinating Council. The Board is to begin operations in October, 1991, and, in its first year, will focus on compiling an inventory of the state training system, developing a comprehensive plan for work force training and education, and establishing standards for data collection in the various agencies concerned with training.

The legislation also places heightened emphasis on vocational education at the postsecondary level by replacing the existing system of vocational-technical institutes with technical colleges offering associate degrees. These technical colleges will now fall under the jurisdiction of the state community college system, rather than local school districts. A new State Board of Community and Technical Colleges will replace the current community college oversight board.

For further information, contact: Bryan Wilson, Office of the Governor, Olympia, WA 98504. Phone: (206) 753-4704.

NEW JERSEY STATE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING COMMISSION

In 1990, New Jersey established by legislation (P.L. 1989 Chapter 193, signed January 12, 1990) the State Employment and Training Commission (SETC) to help develop and implement a comprehensive employment and training policy for the state. Including among its members the heads of the state's major education and economic development agencies, SETC also serves as the State Job Training Coordinating Council.

In its first year of operation (1991), the Commission is implementing a plan to restructure and streamline the administration of workforce readiness programs and to impose performance measures on state occupational programs. The Commission is also developing a single state plan for occupational education, a labor market assessment system, and a system to assure that occupational education programs are made universally available.

The Commission has received strong support from the Governor's office, and participants in SETC deliberations report that agency officials have been sharing information about each others' programs and developing joint strategies, in many cases, for the first time.

For further information, contact: William Tracy, New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission, CN 940, Trenton, NJ 08625. Phone: (609) 633-0605.

CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR WORKFORCE EDUCATION AND SKILLS TRAINING

The California Commission that would be created under Senate Bill 646, which has passed the Legislature and now awaits Governor Pete Wilson's approval, is less a plan than a "plan to plan." Under the legislation, the 17-member California Workforce Education and Skills Training (CALWEST) Commission would be created to develop a master plan, by July 1, 1993, from which the Governor and Legislature can formulate new policies for lifelong education and skills training aimed at the state's non-college-bound youth and adults.

To build upon existing delivery systems, ten major state officials are designated as *ex officio* members, including the heads of the state's three college and university systems and the director of the Employment Development Department. The legislation also appropriates $150,000 for Commission expenses and directs the Secretary of Child Development to request a matching amount from the State's Employment Training Panel Fund (see Chapter Ten).

The Commission would be based on the Legislature's findings that "there is a critical need for a well-articulated education program to assist in the transition from school to work for non-college-bound youth," including training of educators for non-college-bound youth. The bill notes that "unlike the Master Plan for Higher Education, there is no master plan for the workforce education and training of California's underserved youth and adults."

Among other things, the Commission is directed to recommend policies:

—Incorporating technology for adult workforce education into state policies and legislation;
—Creating incentives for California employers to invest in continuing education;

—Expanding the state's apprenticeship program; and

—Creating a network of field stations of action research on adult education in the California State University and California Community College systems.

For further information, contact: Don Woodside, 4934 Huntridge Lane, Fair Oaks, CA 95628. Phone: (916) 961-9352.

CHAPTER THREE: SCHOOL-TO-EMPLOYMENT TRANSITIONS

A number of states have taken steps to plan or implement a comprehensive school-to-employment policy for their state's schools.

First we report on two states—Oregon and Wisconsin—whose legislatures enacted bills in 1991 establishing comprehensive school-to-employment policies. While differences between the two will be noted, both raise standards and establish a new mechanism, a "Certificate of Initial Mastery" (as recommended in *America's Choice*), for students to achieve by the end of tenth grade. Afterwards, they would choose: (1) a college preparatory course of study in the eleventh and twelfth grades, or (2) a professional, technical or vocational course of study to be completed at the end of high school or after technical or community college.

These new policies are based on a belief that the schools have required far too little of non-college-bound students, especially students in the general curriculum, in terms of basic skills and academic subject knowledge, as well as job-related skills and critical thinking abilities. The new Certificate and curriculum options, which would replace the general curriculum, are aimed at assuring that students are placed on a path leading to career success whether in the labor force after high school or after pursuing postsecondary education.

Wisconsin's legislation includes a postsecondary enrollment options program and originally included revisions in the state's child labor laws (which were vetoed by the Governor) and a postsecondary enrollment options program. Wisconsin also includes student apprenticeship and tech prep programs, both of which Oregon has instituted under separate authority (see Chapters Four and Five, below.) The Oregon legislation also includes provision for youth centers to provide "second chance" education and training for school dropouts and those requiring additional skills upgrading.

Despite their differences, the philosophy underlying both bills is the same: only a thorough reorientation of the high school curriculum, based upon higher standards, proficiency assessment and hands-on, experience-based learning, will bring about a world-class workforce.

OREGON EDUCATIONAL ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

The 1991 Oregon Legislature enacted HB 3565, sponsored by Representative (and former Speaker) Vera Katz. The law makes sweeping changes in the state school system aimed at raising student achievement in key subject areas and assuring that Oregon high school students are well prepared upon graduation both for college and the world of work. The total plan, which is to be phased in gradually on a pay-as-you-go basis, includes the following elements:

- —Beefing up early childhood programs and establishment of ungraded primary school programs for students from kindergarten through third grade.
- —Raising curriculum and performance to "world-class standards," along with periodic, performance-based student assessments emphasizing critical thinking skills and higher achievement in mathematics, science, reading and other academic subjects.
- —Provision for a Certificate of Initial Mastery by the end of tenth grade, after which students will enter either a college preparatory program and/or one of a number of vocational or professional curricula emphasizing applied academics, youth or student apprenticeships, and other school-to-work, experience-based education models. Choice of the appropriate curriculum will be made with advice from parents and school guidance counselors. Students will also have opportunities to transfer among the various curricula.
- —Provision for the Bureau of Labor to develop proposed regulations for legislative approval

covering the circumstances under which students can be employed if they have not yet earned the Certificate of Initial Mastery.

—Upon high school graduation, and after students have completed two years in either the college preparatory or vocational/ professional curricula (or both), students will receive a Certificate of Advanced Mastery.

—Establishment of a network of second-chance or alternative Learning Centers designed to help dropouts attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery. The Centers will also integrate support services, such as day care, parental training, health services, employment counseling and drug counseling. This initiative is to be implemented only after most of the others are funded and in place.

The Legislature also intends to monitor the process to assure that students from disadvantaged backgrounds are not inappropriately "tracked" into exclusively non-college-bound curricula.

For further information, contact: Representative Vera Katz, State Capitol, Salem, OR 97310. Phone: (503) 378-8082.

WISCONSIN SCHOOL TO WORK INITIATIVE

On July 3, 1991, the Wisconsin Legislature passed AB 91, the Wisconsin School-to-Work Initiative. The legislation was based largely on recommendations of State Superintendent of Public Instruction Herbert Grover. It was also informed by an April, 1991, report of the Governor's Commission for a Quality Workforce and a March, 1991, report of the Joint Task Force on Implementing Occupational Options in Wisconsin. Governor Tommy Thompson signed the bill, after making extensive use of his line-item veto authority. The new initiative, which took effect as 1991 Wisconsin Act 39 on August 8, 1991, has four key components:

Tenth Grade Gateway Assessment

Wisconsin schools will institute a Tenth Grade Gateway Assessment of core competencies that will be: ***multidisciplinary*** (such as reading, writing, computation and scientific literacy); ***performance-based*** (including problem-solving, analytical skills and critical reasoning skills); and ***based on parent involvement.***

Technical Preparation

School districts will be required to establish, with the assistance of vocational education district boards, a technical preparation program in each high school financed by the school district. State education officials are to provide technical assistance in the development of tech prep programs and to review annual evaluations prepared by each school district. (For more on Tech Prep, see Chapter Five, below.)

Youth Apprenticeship

The legislation authorizes a youth apprenticeship program in the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations (DILHR). In cooperation with the Department of Public Instruction and the State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, DILHR is to develop and maintain a youth apprenticeship program statewide and prepare a report, by October 31, 1992, for the Governor and Legislature describing the actions necessary to establish the program, including budget and staffing needs.

A 12-member council is created to coordinate the development and establishment of the youth apprenticeship program. Members will include one vocational administrator, one high school administrator, three vocational instructors, three high school teachers, two representatives of business and two representatives of labor. (Student or youth apprenticeship is discussed in Chapter Four, below.)

Postsecondary Enrollment Options

Beginning in academic year 1992-93, eleventh and twelfth graders will be able to take one or more courses (up to 15 credit hours per semester) at a campus of the University of Wisconsin, a postsecondary vocational college, or a Wisconsin private college, provided that they meet entrance requirements and participate on a space-available basis. If the course is taken for high school credit, the public school district must pay the cost of tuition.

Vetoed: Child Labor Law Revision

The legislation originally included a variety of provisions limiting the conditions under which high school students may be employed. These provisions were item-vetoed by the Governor, but since we understand that they may soon be instituted through executive action, we present them here.

Under the legislation, minors 16 and older would not have been permitted to work: (1) more than four hours on a school day or more than 26 hours in a school week; (2) before 7:00 AM or after 11:00 PM before a school day; (3) more than 10 hours on

a nonschool day or 50 hours a week in which there are no school days; and (4) before 6:00 AM on a non-school night or after 12:30 AM before a non-school night.

Minors younger than 16 would not have been permitted to work: (1) more than three hours on a school day or more than 18 hours a week in which there is a school day; (2) before 7:00 AM or after 7:00 PM before a school day; (3) more than eight hours on a nonschool day or 40 hours in a week in which there are no school days; and (4) before 7:00 AM on a nonschool night or after 10:00 PM before a nonschool night. Farm labor and domestic service are excluded.

If the minor received school credit for the work, a written training agreement would have to be entered into by the minor, the employer, the minor's school principal and the minor's legal guardian, regarding expectations, rights and responsibilities of all parties. The employer, with the assistance of the teacher supervising the minor's work, would periodically provide performance evaluations. If the student's school work was seen to suffer by the school principal or the student's legal guardian, the work permit would have been revokable.

For further information, contact: Steven Dodd, Assistant Superintendent, Division for Management and Budget, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, PO Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841. Phone: (608) 266-3903.

PLANNING COUNCILS

In addition to the comprehensive school-to-employment programs just undertaken in Oregon and Wisconsin, several states have established councils specifically charged with making recommendations to strengthen the connection between the state's grades K-12 education programs and the world of work. The first one cited, in Vermont, has issued recommendations which are now being implemented. The other two, in Minnesota and New York, are scheduled to issue recommendations in 1991 and 1992, respectively.

VERMONT GETTING READY TO WORK STUDY COMMISSION

In 1988, then Vermont Governor Madeline Kunin appointed the "Getting Ready to Work" Study Commission, comprised of representatives of state government, business, labor and education, to "address the issues of education, job preparation and economic development head-on and shape a system to meet tomorrow's needs."

In 1989, the Commission released a report entitled, *Target 2000: A Report to The Governor and the People of Vermont*, and an implementation timetable. The report made two key recommendations:

—Greater coordination of state education and training programs. The heads of all agencies dealing with adult vocational education and training in 1991 reached a formal cooperative agreement to coordinate funding for education and training, to collaborate in programming and to end competing and duplicative activities.

—Change in the governance of area vocational centers, which are now operated solely by the local school district in which they are located. The recommendation was for a more collaborative governance structure, which is now under study by a state legislative commission.

For further information, contact: Noreen O'Connor, Executive Director, Council on Vocational-Technical Education, 2 Prospect Street, Montpelier, VT 05602. Phone: (802) 223-2550.

MINNESOTA TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRANSITIONS

Legislation enacted in 1991 (Chapter 265, 1991 Minnesota Laws) created the Task Force on Education and Employment Transitions. The Task Force is charged with developing a statewide plan to improve the public school system's performance in providing students "with awareness of employment opportunities, demonstrat(ing) the relationship between education and employment and the applicability of education to employment, identify(ing) an individual's employment interests, and assist(ing) the individual to make transitions between education and employment."

The Task Force is to issue an interim report to the Legislature by February 15, 1992, and a final report by January 15, 1993. These reports will identify efforts in Minnesota and other states and countries that successfully prepare people for employment; suggest how to overcome barriers in public-private collaboration in this area; and show how to integrate education-employment transition programs and outcome-based education throughout the curriculum. The Task Force includes individuals inside and outside government, labor, industry, agriculture and human services, as well as four members of the Legislature.

Minnesota's legislation followed publication of a report of the Legislative Task Force on Minnesota's Human Resource Strategies for the 1990's in March, 1991, entitled, *Minnesota's Forgotten Half*. Noting that "the majority of Minnesota's workers hold jobs that don't require a baccalaureate degree and (that) the prosperity of these forgotten half workers is critical" to the state's future, the legislative task force recommended the institution of individualized learning plans throughout the schools, community service and mentoring, and support for innovative approaches to structure better transitions from education into the workforce.

For further information, contact: Representative Ken Nelson, State Capitol, St. Paul, MN 55155. Phone: (612) 296-4244. Also: John Mercer, Executive Director, State Council on Vocational Technical Education, 407 Gallery Building, 17 West Exchange Street, St. Paul, MN 55102. Phone: (612) 296-4202.

NEW YORK TASK FORCE ON CREATING CAREER PATHWAYS FOR NEW YORK'S YOUTH

Governor Mario Cuomo established the Task Force on Creating Career Pathways for New York's Youth in 1991 to develop recommendations for creating more effective school-to-work transition programs. The Task Force held its first meeting in April, 1991, and will submit initial recommendations in December, 1991, to the New York State Human Resource Investment Subcabinet.

The Task Force is presently engaged in developing state policy. It is exploring questions such as: Who needs to be served by a school-to-work transition system? What should these students know to be competitive in the workforce? What are the best instructional strategies? What is the appropriate role of community involvement?

The Task Force is jointly supported by the New York State Education Department and the New York State Job Training Partnership Council (SJTPC). Regent Walter Cooper and JTPC Vice-Chair Thomas Hobart serve as co-chairs of the Task Force, which is comprised of representatives from education, business, labor, the Legislature, state and local governments, and secondary and postsecondary education agencies.

For further information, contact: James A. Kadamus, Assistant Commissioner, the Office of Continuing Education, New York State Education Department, Room 5D28, Cultural Education Center, Empire State Plaza, Albany, NY 12230. Phone: (518) 474-3981 or David Gillette, Executive Director, New York State Job Training Partnership Council, 17th Floor, Alfred E. Smith State Office Building, Albany, New York 12225. Phone: (518) 474-6014.

Chapter Four: Student Apprenticeship

In a number of European countries, most notably Germany, formal apprenticeship programs administered by employers, using standards developed by industry-wide councils, are a major avenue by which youth enter the workforce. In what was formerly the Federal Republic of Germany, as of 1989, 1.7 million young people—about 70 percent of the 16 to 19 year-old age group—were apprenticing with about half a million employers to earn formal certification in 380 different occupations. (This figure is cited in an excellent information source about apprenticeship programs, *Combining School and Work: Options in High Schools and Two-Year Colleges.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, March, 1991.)

In the United States, however, apprenticeship has not caught on in the same way. Only about 300,000 individuals, mostly in their late twenties or older, were in apprenticeship programs in 1989. Fewer than two percent of high school graduates enter apprenticeships, which typically begin at age 18 and usually require a high school diploma. At least three-fourths of these apprentices were preparing to be skilled craftworkers either in the construction industry or in large-scale manufacturing.

Combining School and Work reports:

> "National standards governing apprenticeship are . . . limited. Current federal regulations, issued in 1977, identify characteristics that apprenticeship programs must possess in order to be registered. These include the existence of an organized training plan, a minimum of 144 hours per year of classroom instruction, a minimum of 2,000 hours on the job under a written training agreement, a progressively increasing wage scale, and specific administrative requirements. In 23 states these standards are administered directly by the federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in the Department of Labor. In the remaining 27 states the Bureau shares responsibility with state apprenticeship councils. Federal regulations do not specify the actual content of training or examinations."

Traditional trade apprenticeships are not as widespread in the United States as in Europe for a variety of reasons, among them: the lack of a strong tradition of national employer guilds and labor unions controlling workforce entry standards, the absence of an American tradition of lifelong fidelity to the employer, the contrary American tradition of high worker mobility.

However, as noted in Chapter One, expanding *student* apprenticeship opportunities is emerging as a major theme of many reformers who wish to strengthen the bond between schooling and employment. An August, 1991 report of the U.S. General Accounting Office, *Transition from School to Work: Linking Education and Worksite Training* (GAO/HRD-91-105), called for a major expansion of high school apprenticeship programs.

A number of states have responded to that theme by undertaking new apprenticeship initiatives. These apprenticeships are generally more on an American model, in which the schools play the major education and training role, rather than the European model, in which employers play a more active role.

In the following pages, we report on new student apprenticeship initiatives in Arkansas and Oregon (by legislation); in Pennsylvania (by executive action); on a regional effort to strengthen apprenticeship and other school-to-employment programming in states belonging to the Council of Great Lakes Governors; and on planning grants made to ten states by the Council of Chief State School Officers. Also recall that the Wisconsin School-to-Work Initiative (described in Chapter Three) establishes a student apprenticeship program.*

*An informative discussion of some of the key issues in youth or student apprenticeship is contained in *Youth Apprenticeship, American Style: A Strategy for Expanding School and Career Opportunities* (1990); available from Consortium on Youth Apprenticeship, c/o Jobs for the Future, 48 Grove Street, Somerville, MA 02144.

ARKANSAS YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP INITIATIVE

Under legislation introduced by Governor Bill Clinton and enacted by the Legislature (1991 Arkansas Acts 546 and 553), Arkansas is now implementing a statewide Youth Apprenticeship Initiative. With $1 million in FY '92 funding and $2 million in FY '93, the appropriations will support 10 to 12 apprenticeship project grants around the state. The funding will be used to establish programs on the "European model" under which much of the responsibility for program design and execution falls on business in partnership with education. Some of the funding will be used to strengthen existing apprenticeship programs.

A state feasibility study identified the need and promise of a flagship program in health services, and the initiation of programs in industrial machinery, small-scale retail management, metal-working, and food service processing/management.

The Youth Apprenticeship Program is one of a number of efforts to be supported through a new Educational Excellence Trust Fund which targets to education all funds raised from a one-half cent sales tax increase and by applying the sales tax to the sale of used vehicles. The Fund provides money for teacher salary increases, for colleges and universities, for early childhood education and adult literacy programs, for a math and science residential high school, for a rural model magnet school, and for college scholarships. The Legislature also authorized a one-half percent increase in the corporate income tax, pushed by Governor Clinton and supported by Arkansas educators, to improve programs and to dramatically increase enrollment. These funds are to be used to create a system of technical centers to provide greater access to academic and training programs.

For further information, contact: Emily Barrier, Office of the Governor, State Capitol, Little Rock, AR 72201. Phone: (501) 682-2345. Also: Jean McEntire, Instructional Programs, Vocational and Technical Education Division, Arkansas Department of Education, Three Capitol Mall-Luther S. Hardin Building, Little Rock, AR 72201-1083. Phone: (501) 682-1040.

OREGON YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Authorized in House Bill 3469, enacted by the Oregon Legislature in 1991, the Oregon Youth Apprenticeship Training Program is a pilot program to provide occupational training for up to 100 high school students to help them make a transition to post-high school apprenticeship programs.

Participants must be high school students at least 16 years old who are enrolled in a technical vocational program. Wages will be paid by the employer, who will receive an offsetting tax credit for participating in the program. Wages shall begin at 80 percent of the first period of the apprenticeship wage established by the appropriate apprenticeship committee, but not less than the state minimum wage. Students will be able to work up to 20 hours per week while enrolled in classes; the combined in-school coursework and on-the-job training cannot exceed 40 hours a week.

For further information, contact: Quint Rahberger, Administrator, Apprenticeship Training Division, Bureau of Labor and Industries, P.O. Box 800, Portland, OR 97207-0800. Phone: (503) 229-6573.

PENNSYLVANIA YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

With more than $1.5 million in development funding from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, U.S. Department of Labor, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the Heinz Endowment, Pennsylvania initiated planning for a state Youth Apprenticeship program in mid-1990. The program is focused initially on the metalworking industry in four areas of the state with significant clusters of metalworking shops. In September 1991, 12 eleventh graders entered an experimental "laboratory" program in Williamsport, Pennsylvania: participants will receive their classroom instruction at the local campus of Penn State and serve their apprenticeship at one of six participating local firms.

The Williamsport program will test key design elements of the statewide effort, including portfolio assessment, work-based mentoring, the integration of academic and vocational instruction, and work-based curriculum projects developed by the University of Pittsburgh's Learning Research and Development Center. This "laboratory" will enable the other sites—in the Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and York/Lancaster regions—to benefit from Williamsport's experience. Programs at those sites will be launched in September, 1992 with over 100 students.

The program will consist of a new four-year integrated curriculum combining academic, technical and occupational education for 16 to 17 year-olds who have completed the tenth grade. Youth

apprentices will be paid a stipend by their employer which will gradually increase during the four years of the program. They will finish with a high school diploma, skilled worker status, and up to two years of postsecondary credits transferable to four-year colleges in Pennsylvania. Both the student and employer must agree to the apprenticeship as they would for any job.

The project grew out of a 1990 interagency Work-Based Learning Study Team which concluded that, while other nations' apprenticeship programs could not be adapted directly to Pennsylvania, the state could profitably embrace a number of key programmatic principles, such as: (1) using the workplace as a learning center and integrating school with work; (2) measuring learning in terms of common proficiency standards; (3) emphasizing technical flexibility, critical thinking and "learning to learn" skills; (4) integrating secondary and postsecondary credentials; and (5) promoting the value and status of manufacturing employment. While the statewide program is beginning with metalworking, the state plans to expand to other industries and occupations with significant potential in both manufacturing and services. Pennsylvania's Department of Education has recently received a grant from the Council of Chief State School Officers (see below) to develop an expansion strategy.

For further information, contact: Jean Wolfe, Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program, c/o MANTEC, Inc., P.O. Box 5046, York, PA 17405. Phone: (717) 843-2898.

COUNCIL OF GREAT LAKES GOVERNORS YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP AND SCHOOL-TO-WORK INITIATIVE

The Council of Great Lakes Governors is developing an initiative to strengthen school-to-work transition programs in its eight member states. The Council represents the governors of Indiana, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ohio.

The initiative will reinforce school-to-work transition programs in three ways. First, the Council will serve as an information clearinghouse to help member states create and expand state programs, such as apprenticeships and tech prep, more quickly, cheaply and efficiently. Along these lines, the Council has already put together a regional network of key policy officials, and is undertaking a comprehensive survey and evaluation of school-to-career projects in the region.

Second, the Council will be able to help state school-to-work programs collaborate across state lines in complementary industries or occupations. For example, Indiana might concentrate on one industry and Ohio on another. When two or more states have training programs in the same industry, the Council will help them collaborate; for example, a company with sites in New York and Pennsylvania could concentrate on students receiving comparable training in the different jurisdictions.

Finally, the Council will attempt to develop a system of "cross-walks" among educational programs and occupational standards developed in different states. The goal is to develop compatible, mutually understood, and mutually recognized standards, rather than identical criteria. As this is worked out, workers with skills certified in one state could have their training acknowledged when seeking work or further training in another state.

For further information, contact: Jeffrey McCourt, Economic Policy Director, Council of Great Lakes Governors, 35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1350, Chicago, IL 60601. Phone: (312) 407-0177.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS APPRENTICESHIP AWARDS

With funds provided by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) on August 27, 1991, awarded planning grants of $20,000 each to ten state education agencies to design and develop youth apprenticeships. Second-stage grants for implementation will be made early in 1992 to a smaller number of states based upon their proposed plans for connecting schools and workplaces.

For further information about this grant program and CCSSO'S technical assistance, contact: Cynthia Brown or Christopher Harris, Council of Chief State School Officers, Suite 379, 400 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001. Phone: (202) 393-8159.

Contacts for the ten state planning grants are:

Arkansas	Jean McEntire	(501) 682-1040
California	Alan Weisberg	(916) 265-5671
Illinois	Ron Engstrom	(217) 782-4877
Iowa	Mary Wiberg	(515) 281-8584
Michigan	Daniel Woodward	(517) 335-0359
Pennsylvania	Stephen Franchak	(717) 787-5530
Vermont	Robert McLaughlin	(802) 229-2658
Virginia	Kay Brown	(804) 225-2886
West Virginia	Bill Wilcox	(304) 348-0280
Wisconsin	Eunice Bethke	(608) 267-9244

Chapter Five: Technical Preparation (Tech Prep)

An idea taken up by a number of states and communities in the 1980's, and that is now spreading to all of the states thanks to the passage of new federal legislation, is called "tech prep" or "2 + 2" (two years in high school, two years in college).

In a tech prep or 2 + 2 program, one or more community colleges and high schools enter into an "articulation agreement" under which they offer a coordinated four-year sequence of academic and technical courses starting in 11th grade and ending with a certificate or associate degree in a technical field. Applied academics coursework is considered essential in this coherent sequence of studies. (A variant of the concept is called "2 + 2 + 2," under which a further articulation agreement from the two-year-college level to the four-year college level is provided, enabling the successful student to earn a bachelor's degree.)

The tech prep concept was first enunciated by Dale Parnell, then president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, in *The Neglected Majority* (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985). Dr. Parnell maintained that tech prep can be ideal for the middle two quartiles of students, those who will be entering occupations requiring some beyond-high school education and training, but not necessarily a baccalaureate degree.*

Tech prep programs are characterized by:

—Strong career counseling, beginning well before the 11th grade;
—Genuine school-college collaboration. School and college faculty both reorient their basic curricula to develop a unified or coherent whole;
—Programs usually have an executive committee and operational committee drawn from school and community college officials;
—Applied academics in basic subject areas. The point, according to Parnell, is that "a course in business-letter writing can be rigorous and help students demonstrate writing skills. A course in business mathematics can. . . help students master computing percentages or applying statistical methods;
—Gradually increasing technical concentration, which becomes predominant at the community college level;
—Strong business involvement. Local firms generally serve on tech prep planning councils, help develop curriculum, and encourage student participation in the program.

This chapter reports on the Indiana Tech Prep Curriculum Model because it was the first such program instituted through state legislation. We also make note of a number of other state and local efforts. Finally, we report on federal legislation that is expected to institutionalize tech prep around the country.

INDIANA TECHNOLOGY PREPARATION CURRICULUM MODEL PROGRAM

Legislation enacted in 1987 (Indiana Code 20-10.1-5.6-1) called for the appointment of a task force to develop a technology preparation curriculum model for all Indiana high school students on a phased timetable (amended in 1990) starting in September, 1991, and completed in the 1994-95 school year.

"Tech-Prep," as defined in Indiana, is "a rigorous and focused program of study . . . designed to better prepare . . . students enrolled in the general studies curriculum for the demands of further education or for employment by providing them with essential academic and technical foundations, along with problem-solving group process and lifelong learning skills."

*See also the new book by Dan Hull and Dale Parnell. *Tech Prep Associate Degree: A Win/Win Experience*. Waco, TX: Center for Occupational Research and Development, 1991.

Features of the Indiana Tech-Prep curriculum include:

—A core of competencies in mathematics, science, English/ language arts, economics, computer literacy and career awareness;
—An articulated secondary-postsecondary curriculum;
—Multiple entry points (e.g., 9th, 10th, 11th grades) into the curriculum;
—Performance-based coursework, and an emphasis on problem-solving, critical thinking skills, teamwork and cooperative learning; and
—Locally-determined electives.

For further information, contact: Stan Jones, Indiana Department of Workforce Development, Indiana Government Center-South, 10 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2277. Phone: (317) 232-1814.

BOEING COMPANY AND TECH PREP

In *Washington State*, The Boeing Company is engaged in partnerships with schools in the areas of tech prep and applied academics. In 1990–91, the company awarded over $400,000 to Washington schools to implement applied academic programs. In 1991, Boeing's participation expanded to community colleges for curriculum development and articulation with local high schools.

On behalf of Boeing, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) is assisting two Washington community college districts—Seattle and Yakima—and their feeder schools in the development and evaluation of model tech prep programs.

NWREL is also evaluating the Boeing-sponsored implementation of three applied academic packages in 21 high schools around Washington state. Schools were invited to adopt Principles of Technology (applied physics), Applied Communication (English/ language arts), or Applied Mathematics. Each curriculum was developed by a consortium of states. Ten applied academics teachers were also selected in 1990 (another ten in 1991) as summer interns at Boeing to see first-hand how school subject matter can be enriched by industry examples.

During the next two years, Boeing and NWREL will be working closely to:

—Define a set of articulation agreements by selected high schools and community colleges:
—Promote involvement by participating educators and local business and industry leaders in developing applied academics coursework;
—Design replicable in-service training for participating schools and colleges;
—Design replicable high school curriculum for college credit and community college curriculum;
—Identify colleges interested in adopting the model and businesses interested in hiring students who have completed the program; and
—Disseminate information about this program on a regional basis.

For further information contact: Larry McClure, Project Director, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 S. W. Main Street, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204. Phone: (503) 275-9597 or (800) 547-6339.

OTHER STATE TECH PREP PROGRAMS

. . . In *North Carolina*, the Richmond County schools instituted a tech prep program in 1986, which school Superintendent Doug James maintains "has had the greatest impact on secondary education in Richmond County since high school consolidation in 1971." Today, about 30 percent of County students are involved in the tech prep program, with SAT scores on the rise, dropout rates falling, and a 28 percent increase in community college enrollment by participating students. In 1990, the state began awarding planning monies to other districts to replicate the program's success.

For further information, contact: Myrtle Stogner, North Carolina Tech Prep Leadership Training Center, Richmond Community College, P.O. Box 1189, Hamlet, NC 28345.

. . . In *Maryland*, two Tech Prep initiatives are part of a Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development strategy to connect school and work across the state. ***Maryland Tech Prep Plus*** has developed articulation agreements between school districts and community colleges which include the addition of technical curricula and the elimination of general education at the secondary school level. ***Maryland MechTech*** has developed school-to-work connections whereby high school youth begin rotating work experience among a consortium of manufacturing firms; work experience continues through community college in an articu-

lated program leading to an Associate's degree and entrance into formal apprenticeship.

For further information, contact: Vernon Thompson, Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development, 1100 N. Eutaw Street, Baltimore, MD 21201. Phone: (301) 333-7650.

. . . In *Boston, ProTech* connects students at several high schools with formal structured work-site learning at local hospitals. This school/work relationship continues during community college leading to an Associate's degree and to licensed, high-paying technical professions.

For further information, contact: Lois Ann Porter, School-To-Work Youth Director, Private Industry Council, 2 Oliver Street, Boston, MA 02109. Phone: (617) 423-3755.

. . . In *Michigan*, a 23-member statewide Tech Prep Task Force was established in 1988 to develop models. The Task Force recommended that the state government, among other things:

—Encourage all community colleges and public school districts within each community college outreach area to develop Tech Prep partnerships;
—Initiate a statewide public relations plan to inform students, parents, the general public and business/industry about the benefits of Tech Prep;
—Establish a statewide Tech Prep Advisory Committee and a state technical assistance office;
—Fund demonstration programs; and
—Develop model Technical Preparation Programs for out-of-school adults.

Some of these recommendations were implemented beginning in the fall of 1988. Since then, the Michigan Department of Education has made over 30 tech prep grants utilizing a mixture of federal and state funds.

For further information, contact: James Folkening, Supervisor, Community College Services, Michigan Department of Education, Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909. Phone: (517) 373-3360.

. . . In *Rhode Island*, a 2 + 2 Tech-Prep Associate Degree Program was established in 1987 as a cooperative effort between the Community College of Rhode Island and the Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Now entering its fifth year, the program was one of three initial recipients of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Tech Prep/Associate Degree awards.

For further information, contact: Ed Liston, President, Community College of Rhode Island, 400 East Avenue, Warwick, RI 02886-1485. Phone: (401) 825-2188.

NATIONAL TECH PREP LEGISLATION

The *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990* (P.L. 101-392, Title III, Part E) establishes a new Tech-Prep Education program under which federal grants are offered to the states which, in turn, provide funds to local consortia of schools and colleges to institute tech-prep programs with the characteristics enumerated earlier.

An initial appropriation of $63.4 million was made for the program in FY 1991. Each state has submitted a State Plan for operating the program to the U.S. Education Department. The first tech-prep programs supported by the legislation are expected to get underway in September, 1991.

For further information about federally-funded tech-prep programs, contact your state Department of Vocational Education or the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-7241. Phone: (202) 732-2441.

Other good sources of information about tech prep efforts are: Jim McKenney, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, One Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Phone: (202) 728-0200; and Madeleine Hemmings, Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, 1420 16th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036. Phone: (202) 328-0216.

For further information about school-to-work demonstration projects funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, contact: James D. Van Erden, Administrator, Office of Work-Based Learning, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20210. Phone: (202) 535-0540.

CHAPTER SIX: YOUTH COMMUNITY SERVICE

The national movement to increase opportunities for youth community service is based on two beliefs: that youth derive an enhanced sense of self-worth and good citizenship from making a contribution to their communities, and that community service is a particularly valuable educational tool which brings relevance and passion to learning.

The renewed vigor and popularity of the youth community service movement is reflected in the enactment of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-610) and in rapidly expanding state and local community service networks. The new program, with an initial appropriation of $62.5 million, will support a variety of grass-roots volunteer activities, including school-based and campus-based community service projects; conservation and service corps (aimed primarily at youth and young adults no longer in school); and intergenerational service projects.

Currently, over 3,000 service programs operate in the nation's public and private schools, including major school systems like Atlanta and Detroit which have instituted mandatory service as a requirement for graduation. Over 450 college campuses also encourage service under a "campus compact." In addition, there are now 55 year-round service or conservation corps and 20 summer youth corps, together enrolling about 20,000 youth up to age 26. A recent development is the growing use of federal Job Training Partnership Act funds for partial funding of such corps.

For information about the broad range of volunteer service efforts around the country, contact Roger Landrum, Director, Youth Service America, 1319 F Street NW Suite 900, Washington, DC 20004. Phone: (202) 783-8855. YSA's State Resource Guide *lists key state contacts, illustrative local and regional service programs, and national technical assistance organizations.*

In this chapter, we cite three examples of statewide policies related to community service. The first is Pennsylvania's *PennSERVE*, a comprehensive youth community service program; the others are Minnesota's and a new proposal in Maryland to require community service of all high school graduates.

PENNSERVE

PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service invests nearly $7 million in state funds and $3 million in federal funds to support a variety of community service and volunteer programs in the state, with a special focus on youth community service. Located administratively in Pennsylvania's Department of Labor and Industry, PennSERVE reports to a Cabinet Committee headed by the Secretary of Labor and Industry and the Secretary of Education. Among other things, PennSERVE:

—Provides competitive grants to schools, colleges, local government and non-profit agencies to establish school-based service, a literacy corps, and conservation and service corps;

—Serves as an advocate for community service, a vehicle for information and publicity about volunteering;

—Provides technical assistance to local groups interested in community service. This includes support of a statewide community service training institute, The Pennsylvania Youth Institute for Service Learning; and

—Provides financial and technical assistance to other agencies in operating youth service programs. In 1991, PennSERVE helped eight municipalities create new local youth corps programs and assisted the state JTPA program to create a restructured Summer Youth Service Corps, which enrolled 2,000 young people in 200 projects across the state.

A key initiative administered by PennSERVE is the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps (PCC), with a legislative appropriation of $6 million for FY 1992. Since its inception in 1984, 9,000 PCC members, all of whom were unemployed when they joined the program, have undertaken some 450 conservation,

29

recreation and historical projects throughout the state.

PennSERVE supports a wide range of activities in the public schools, including mini-grants to support local school projects, regional workshops for teachers and students, and the Pennsylvania Literacy Corps, which in 1991 enrolled 1,000 youth to serve as literacy tutors. These activities enjoy strong support from the State Board of Education, which has formally resolved that "programs of community service should be an integral part of education at all levels and strongly urges schools, colleges and universities to institute or strengthen community service programs so that every student is encouraged to serve and participate in volunteer service."

The state Department of Education incorporates community service in its award-winning anti-dropout program, Project Success, and includes community service as an alternative means of achieving graduation credit in newly-proposed revisions to the State Code. Similarly, the State College System has appointed a task force to examine making community service a formal part of the admissions process and expanding the use of service-learning in teacher training.

For further information, contact: John Briscoe, PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service, 1304 Labor and Industry Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120. Phone: (717) 787-1971.

MINNESOTA COMMUNITY SERVICE

Minnesota was the first state to organize a statewide, comprehensive youth service model for all young people. Two Governor-appointed planning groups, the Governor's Task Force on Youth Service and Work (1985-1986) and the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Mentoring and Youth Community Service (1990-1991), have successfully advocated several state policies supportive of youth service:

1987 legislation allowed local school districts to levy $.50 per capita for Youth Development programs through Community Education, including Youth Service. 1989 legislation allowed districts to levy an additional $.25 per capita for service-learning programs. In 1991, the Legislature raised the total levy to $.85, combining the two programs under the title of Youth Service. Over 300 school districts (including approximately 90 percent of the state's population) currently levy this special funding. An estimated $3.5 million is generated annually by this local levy/state aid package—the highest per capita subsidy for youth service in the nation.

In 1989, the State Board of Education passed a mandate that all schools should offer youth service opportunities. The mandate was overruled by the Legislature, making the program optional. In 1991, the State Board of Education will publish a service-learning learner outcomes document outlining how youth service is to be shaped in a curriculum context.

According to the Minnesota Department of Education, in 1990:

—Over 40,000 youth, including 15,000 middle school youth, were involved in youth service activities.
—49 local school districts grant credit for youth service.
—58 percent of school districts have peer or cross-age tutoring and 63 percent have peer helper programs.

In 1991 legislation, local Boards of Education are required to include student representatives or to establish a youth advisory council to make formal and informal recommendations to the Board.

1989 legislation administered by the National Youth Leadership Council through the Minnesota higher Education Coordinating Board provided $150,000 in seed support for service programs on 12 college campuses.

Like school-based service, the full-time, year-round Minnesota Conservation Corps has also experienced a steady increase in budget and program the past three biennial budget sessions of the Legislature to a current level of $1.9 million.

For further information, contact: James C. Kielsmeier, President, National Youth Leadership Council, 1910 W. County Rd. B, Roseville, MN 55113. Phone: (612) 631-3672 or the Youth Service Program of Community Education, Minnesota Department of Education, 500 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55101. Phone: (612) 296-1435.

MARYLAND COMMUNITY SERVICE/ SCHOOL-TO-EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

Maryland is the first state requiring each school district to make service opportunities available on an optional basis. In order to further strengthen the connection between school and employment and enhance the sense of community responsibility of

Maryland youth, the Maryland State Board of Education voted on July 31, 1991, to propose that students be required to perform community service as a requirement of high school graduation. The Board is soliciting public reaction to the proposed requirements and is scheduled to make a final decision in November, 1991.

If the decision stands, Maryland will become the first state in the nation to require public service for high school graduation. Students would be required to perform a total of 75 hours of service during high school or middle school. Students would have to formally reflect on that experience, possibly in the form of a paper or class presentation. The ultimate decision on what kind and quality of work is acceptable would be left to local officials.

For further information, contact: Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, Director, Maryland Student Service Alliance, Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201. Phone: (301) 333-2427.

OTHER STATE INITIATIVES

A growing number of other states have also enacted legislation and funded the establishment of community service programs. (See also Chapter Nine.) These include the District of Columbia, as a requirement for high school graduation; Minnesota, for both K-12 and collegiate service (contact telephone: (612) 631-3672); a variety of postsecondary programs: California (first state to legislate in support of campus-based community service (213) 206-3346); Connecticut (203) 563-1106; Florida (904) 644-5590; Illinois (312) 917-2789; and Washington State (206) 753-4592.

CHAPTER SEVEN: EMPLOYERS AS ACTIVE PARTNERS IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The thrust of all the findings of the studies cited at the beginning of this report (Chapter One) is that government, the educational establishment, employers and the nonprofit, private sector must work together more closely to:

—*Develop new standards for curriculum and academic achievement* that are intimately tied to the needs of the modern workplace;

—*Provide a full range of experience-based work-learning opportunities* for both in-school and out-of-school youth; and

—*Invest public and private resources* in the education and training of youth and adults, both in the workforce and out.

Most of the initiatives described thus far in these pages, and those to follow, include an effort to bring the business and employer community into the planning and execution of public education and training strategies. This chapter cites a number of noteworthy examples of broad-based partnerships involving business and education. (See also The Boeing Corporation partnerships discussed in Chapter Five.)*

We start with the *Boston Compact* which has been widely viewed as a forerunner and prototype of successful collaboration, inspiring dozens of cities to try to develop similar partnerships in their communities. The *New York School and Business Alliance (SABA)* is an example of a state-level partnership which provides funds to support local partnership activities. SABA is noteworthy in that it receives an annual legislative appropriation of about $2 million per year. The *Illinois Labor-Management Committee* illustrates how a funding network based on labor and business collaboration can positively affect education and training activities in the state. The *Georgia Technical Education Guarantee* and the Prince Georges' County, Maryland *Guaranteed Employability Program* are examples of school systems (there are others across the country) that are willing to hold themselves accountable to employers for the quality of training they provide. Finally, the *Maryland Passport to the Future* is a program to induce local employers to keep youth in school and to design work activities that complement, rather than conflict with, the academic program.

BOSTON COMPACT

The Boston Compact, initiated in 1982, is a set of formal agreements among the Boston public schools, members of the business community, trade unions and local colleges aimed at improving the education, work preparation, employment opportunities and college attendance prospects of students in the Boston public schools.

Under the terms of the Compact, the school system set measurable goals for improving daily attendance, reducing the dropout rate and raising reading and math performance. In turn, the business community agreed to expand summer jobs and work-study opportunities and to offer priority hiring to graduates of the Boston public high schools.

Participating colleges increased their recruitment of Boston high school students and, in some cases, created new scholarship opportunities for them. A career specialist was placed in each of the participating high schools to coordinate program activities.

In the summer of 1990, despite rising unemployment, over 3,500 students earned over $5 million in 992 firms participating in the Compact. Recent surveys have shown the hourly wage of Boston high school graduates not attending college were

*Many valuable references could be cited here. We suggest, as "starters," three issued by the Business Roundtable: *Essential Components of a Successful Education System* (1991); R. Scott Fosler, *The Business Role in State Education Reform* (1990); *The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education* (1991). For further information, contact: Christopher T. Cross, Executive Director-Education, The Business Roundtable, 1615 L Street, NW Suite 1350, Washington, DC 20036. Phone: (202) 872-1260.

fully 60 percent higher than their counterparts in the nation's central cities, and that this advantage existed for men, women, blacks, Hispanics and whites. Dropout rates in the Boston public schools also declined from over 39 percent in 1986 to 33 percent in 1989.

For further information, contact: Michael Taylor, Boston Private Industry Council, Inc., 2 Oliver Street, Boston, MA 02109. Phone: (617) 423-3755.

FOLLOWUP NOTE: THE COMPACT PROJECT

In 1986, the National Alliance of Business (NAB), with support from the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, began a national demonstration project to help 12 cities establish compacts with their own business communities modeled after the Boston Compact but adjusted to their local needs. The cities are Albuquerque, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Louisville, Memphis, San Diego, Seattle, Detroit, Miami/Dade County, Pittsburgh, Providence, and Rochester (NY). The project ended in December 1990. In several cities, the compacts continued as parts of other community initiatives or as a new program that is an extension of the original. In others, successful programs are being enhanced as a result of the partners' increased understanding of the need for change in the education system.

In a report on the experiment, entitled, *The Compact Project: School-Business Partnerships for Improving Education* (Washington, DC: National Alliance of Business: 1989), NAB delineated six principles for any community seeking to establish a Compact:

(1) develop measurable goals;
(2) designate a business intermediary;
(3) develop a planning structure;
(4) establish baseline data;
(5) secure financial resources; and
(6) organize collaboration.

A final evaluation and lessons learned from the project, entitled, The Compact Project: Final Report, is now available from NAB. For further information, contact: Sandra Byrne, National Alliance of Business, 1201 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Phone: (202) 289-2888.

NAB has two other employer-led education projects: Bank of America-led *Banking on Achievement* project which pairs high school students with structured work-site learning in San Francisco; and a partnership between Sears, Roebuck and a vocational-technical high school in the Chicago area where the school curriculum has been rewritten by industry trainers and school teachers to incorporate high academic skill requirements and to reflect contemporary workplace needs.

NEW YORK SCHOOL AND BUSINESS ALLIANCE

The New York School and Business Alliance (SABA) was established in 1986 to promote local partnerships between public schools and the private sector. These partnerships are designed to increase attendance, raise scholastic achievement, reduce the dropout rate, and provide opportunities for training, employment and postsecondary education for students who are economically and academically disadvantaged.

SABA receives a state appropriation of approximately $2 million per year, under which it solicits proposals from local education agencies for school-business partnerships. Proposals are reviewed by State Education Department officials and by an advisory panel of business and labor leaders, called the Governor's School and Business Alliance Task Force.

To date, SABA's business partners number more than 1,000. Some examples of SABA-funded projects: The Elmira SABA arranged internships for high school students in an engineering firm. A chemical company in Binghamton brought students into the factory to learn about the diversity of chemistry careers and to encourage greater enrollment in chemistry classes. The Broome-Tioga SABA brought teachers from 16 schools to learn about a variety of businesses they'd never explored before. Another project assists prison inmates in finding good jobs after their terms are served.

For further information, contact: Dennis Kagel, Supervisor, Division of Occupational Education Program Services, Room 1624, New York State Education Department, 1 Commerce Plaza, Albany, NY, 12234. Phone: (518) 474-1081.

ILLINOIS LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION COMMITTEE

The Illinois Labor-Management Cooperation Committee was created in 1985 and placed at the head of a coordinated statewide system of area, industry and worksite-level labor-management committees, funded in part with state matching grants. The State-level Committee consists of six labor and six business leaders appointed by the Gov-

ernor and confirmed by the Illinois Senate and six *ex-officio* members from the state executive and legislative branches.

The State-level Committee and the industry and worksite-level committees are each responsible for improving communication between labor and management and for developing joint responses to economic conditions, including new training and education initiatives. The State-level Committee also advises the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs in the award of matching grants to local labor-management committees.

Many of these grants support education and training activities, especially workplace literacy programs. Grants have also supported a business education practicum program, which places non-vocational teachers in local industry to gain a better understanding of business; presentations to high schools to better prepare students for the workplace; and, with JTPA funding, skills training for dislocated workers.

For further information, contact: Lori Clark, Manager, Office of Industrial Training and Labor-Management Cooperation, Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, 620 East Adams, Springfield, IL 62701. Phone: (217) 785-6284.

MARYLAND PASSPORT TO THE FUTURE

Initiated in 1990, Maryland's Passport to the Future program tries to reduce the high school dropout rate, and to bring education and the workplace closer together, by helping students who maintain certain academic and attendance standards to find good part-time and summer jobs.

Participating students must have a C average, a 95 percent attendance record and a signed work agreement. Students meeting these requirements are issued a laminated "Passport to the Future." Employers are encouraged to require that all the young people they hire have these passports. Employers are also encouraged to become partners in the educational process by setting realistic work goals not in conflict with school commitments, by providing on-site training, and by helping students relate the work experience to their academic classroom training.

For further information, contact: Richard Kiley, Specialist, Department of Career and Technology Education, Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201. Phone: (301) 333-2570.

GEORGIA TECHNICAL EDUCATION GUARANTEE

In 1990, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education met with business and industry leaders to develop a new set of curriculum standards for key programs. As a result, Georgia's 32 technical institutes now have a policy of offering a formal guarantee to their business partners concerning graduates employed in the field of their training. The guarantee, good for two years following graduation, reads:

> "If one of our graduates who was educated under a standard program, and his/her employer agree that the employee is deficient in one or more competencies as defined in the standards, the technical institutes will retrain that employee at no instructional cost to the employee or the employer."

For further information, contact: Charles Forton, Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. 660 South Tower, 1 CNN Tower, Atlanta, GA 30303 Phone: (404) 656-6773.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND GUARANTEED EMPLOYABILITY PROGRAM

Since 1989, over 6,000 graduating seniors of Prince George's County, Maryland's public schools have earned wallet-sized *Guaranteed Employability Certificates*. These Certificates are a tangible expression of student readiness for the world of work. As identified by the Superintendent's Advisory Council for Business and Industry, they certify specified employability skills, including basic academics (3 Rs + oral communication) and workplace skills (personal work habits and attitudes, interpersonal relationships, reasoning and problem solving). Each employer of such a graduate is asked to rate the new employee at least twice annually on an Employee Report Card. Employability counselors then work with employees that employers deem not to have mastered sufficient skill levels. Such employees may obtain additional instruction in the County's Multi-Service Community Center or in special classes held at the job site. Neither the student nor the employer is charged tuition for this retraining. The school system's retraining "warranty" to County employers extends for one full year beyond graduation.

For further information, contact: Delores Hill Brown, Prince George's County Public Schools, Highland Park Staff Development Center, 6501 Lowland Drive, Landover, MD 20786. Phone: (301) 336-8870.

CHAPTER EIGHT: ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTERS

By definition, most school dropouts have not thrived in a traditional classroom atmosphere. Yet, abandoning them as unteachable and unreachable makes no sense for society, for the economy, or for the individual and his or her family.

Why not? First, abundant evidence supports that many people who are thought to be "unreachable" at age 16 are eminently reachable not long afterwards. Second, research shows that people who fail in a traditional classroom often succeed quite well in less traditional settings, particularly in an experiential, "hands-on," "learn-by-doing" atmosphere. This is especially likely if essential support services are coordinated with education—services such as child care, health care, financial support, career and family counseling, or job placement.

Finally, it is senseless to abandon dropouts because there are simply so many of them. Unless they are productively incorporated into our economy the entire nation will suffer. As noted earlier, almost 25 percent of all students fail to complete high school today, upwards of 50 percent in some inner cities. Again, as noted in Chapter One, Americans spend disproportionately little to help dropouts get a foothold on success; whereas average annual expenditures per high school pupil are roughly $3,400, the total federal, state and local funding for dropout programs amounts to only $235 per student. Indeed, as the William T. Grant Commission pointed out in *The Forgotten Half*, the average public/private subsidy for college-bound students is $5,000 annually compared with typical "second chance" expenditures of only one-seventh as much. In the end, however, we all pay for this neglect: in prisons, in public assistance and in a weakened economy.

A number of states are taking steps to develop statewide policies regarding the establishment of alternative education or support centers for dropouts and others needing to upgrade their skills.

As noted in Chapter Three, the *Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century* authorizes the establishment of a statewide youth centers program for dropouts, although funds are yet to be appropriated for this new venture. In this chapter, we discuss *New Jersey School-Based Youth Services, Kentucky Youth Services Centers*, the *New York STEP Program* and *Minnesota Alternative Learning Centers*. We also report on three other New York programs: the *ACCESS/CASSET, Gateway*, and the *Skills Opportunity Centers* program. Finally, we cite examples of an innovative use of the federal *Job Corps* to provide alternative learning environments for youth.

NEW JERSEY SCHOOL-BASED YOUTH SERVICES PROGRAM

In 1988, the New Jersey State General Assembly earmarked $6 million to launch the School-Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP). Its purpose is to help 13-19 year-old adolescents, especially those considered at high risk of dropping out of school, to complete their education, obtain skills leading to either employment or additional education, and to enjoy mentally and physically healthy and drug-free lives. By providing a comprehensive set of services on a "one-stop shopping" basis, the School-Based Youth Services Program links education and human service delivery. Each center is easily accessible, usually located at or near a secondary school.

Rather than imposing a single program model, the state allows each community to design its own program requiring only that every center offer a set of core services, including health care, mental health and family counseling, job and employment training, and substance abuse counseling. In addition, most centers choose to include recreation and information and referral services. Many others provide parenting education, day care, tutoring, family planning, transportation and information hotlines. Programs operate before, during, and after the school day and, in some cases, year-round and on weekends. In 1989, 29 sites, at least one in every county across the state, provided a range of services to over 19,000 teens, approximately one out of every three eligible students. Over 9,000 of these young people were classified as at serious risk of dropping out of school.

School-based youth services centers are designed and managed by both public and private nonprofit entities representing a broad consortium of local organizations for example, boards of education, social service agencies, health care providers, local government, parent and teacher organiza-

tions, unions, community organizations, the employment and training community and employers. Schools must demonstrate willingness to coordinate existing school services with the center's planned services, but they are not required to assume lead responsibility for the overall management of the programs. Over half of the SBYSPs are managed under non-school auspices, including mental health agencies, a private industry council, a community development organization, medical schools and hospitals.

Funds are intended to augment and coordinate existing services for adolescents. In addition, host communities must contribute at least 25 percent toward the total costs of the program through either cash or in-kind services, including facilities, space and materials. Sites providing health services may apply for designation as a Medicaid provider and receive Medicaid reimbursement.

An additional $500,000 appropriation has been earmarked to develop an elementary school demonstration. The New Jersey plan has also been the model for other state-wide efforts to assist youth and families, particularly that of Kentucky.

For further information, contact: Roberta Knowlton, Department of Human Services, CN 700, Trenton, NJ 08625. Phone: (609) 292-1617 or 292-7816.

KENTUCKY YOUTH SERVICES CENTERS

In 1990, the Kentucky General Assembly enacted comprehensive school reform legislation (KRS 156.497), including the creation of a statewide network of support service centers, called Family Resource Centers for children under age 12 and Youth Service Centers for persons over age 12. An Interagency Task Force on Family Resource and Youth Services Centers was given a five-year mandate to establish the Centers.

It is extremely important to underline that these Centers are just one part of the Kentucky plan which has been described as "a comprehensive, integrated, aggressive, outcomes-focused, consequences-driven, resources-supported human capital development effort." In addition to providing for the Centers, the law includes the following components to be phased in by 1996:

—Outcomes focus, including high levels of reading, math, science, history, geography; a focus on main ideas; skills of self sufficiency; skills of good citizenship, including community service; critical thinking and problem-solving; integration of knowledge; post-graduation success; dropout and retention reduction; and attendance increase.

—A new assessment system emphasizing portfolios, projects and performance-based strategies.

—A system of strong rewards and sanctions responsive to student performance with the school as the unit of focus. These rewards and sanctions include financial bonuses and suspension of tenure for school district staff.

—School site councils comprised of three teachers, two parents and the school administrator with significant authority related to personnel, budget, curriculum, instruction, methodology and other areas related to instruction.

—A major expansion of professional development and renewal opportunities.

—Entitlement to a quality, developmentally appropriate pre-kindergarten program for all disadvantaged students.

—A comprehensive, statewide technology initative.

—The fiscal capacity to expand schooling for young people before school, after school, on weekends and during the summer when they require more time to achieve the expected high outcomes.

—Upgraded primary schools through the third grade.

—A state funding increase of approximately 35 percent.

The state does not consider these components a "pick and choose menu." They are *all* deemed necessary to produce a generation of young people with the skills and abilities to enable themselves, their families and Kentucky to prosper.

The Family Resource and Youth Service Centers will be attached to a local school or consortium of public schools in which at least 20 percent of the enrolled students are eligible for free school meals. Once established, however, Center services will be made available to all residents. An initial appropriation of $9.5 million was made in FY 92 to support the creation of 125 to 150 Centers. The Act provides that all schools which meet the legislative criteria will have centers phased in over a four-year period.

Youth Service Centers will sometimes provide services directly to clients. More often, they will refer clients to other service agencies with which the Centers work collaboratively, offering services such as:

—Health and social services;

—Employment counseling, training and placement;

—Summer and part-time job development;

—Drug and alcohol abuse counseling; and
—Family crisis and mental health counseling.

Employment services might include referral to a JTPA and JOBS program (under the Family Support Act of 1988); targeted training to establish a "positive work ethic," the creation of a private industry network to facilitate job placement; and recruitment of local volunteers to coordinate classes on job interviewing skills. Ancillary services could include parental outreach, recreational activities, community service, adolescent parent programs, skill development groups, and peer support groups.

The relationship between the program and the participant is considered the most important element in the program. In contrast to schooling, participation is voluntary and participants do not have to be labelled as having a "problem" to be eligible for services.

For further information, contact: Ronnie Dunn, Cabinet for Human Resources, 275 East Main, Frankfort, KY 40621. Phone: (502) 564-4986.

MINNESOTA AREA LEARNING CENTERS

Minnesota has created 36 Area Learning Centers (ALCs) to provide flexible education and training options for school-aged students and out-of-school youth who have been unsuccessful in more traditional classroom settings. First established by the Legislature as a pilot program in 1987, the ALCs are funded primarily through state support to school districts. ALCs are also eligible to receive state development grants of up to $10,000 (out of a FY '92 appropriation of $150,000). While all current ALCs are operated by school districts, the law allows other public and private institutions to form partnerships with the school district to operate an ALC.

ALCs provide a variety of services, including programs for teenage parents (with day care available), tutoring and remedial education leading to a high school diploma, vocational training, life skills development, work-study and job placement. Adults are eligible for Center services, but most participants are youth between 12 and 20 years old who are referred by their school district as behind their peers academically, as parents, pregnant or chemically dependent.

For further information, contact: Gene Johnson, Alternative Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Education, 987 Capitol Square Building, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101. Phone: (612) 296-7428.

NEW YORK STEP PROGRAM

Established in 1984, the STEP (School To Employment) program now offers nearly $2.4 million to support career planning, vocational exploration and remedial education services for dropouts between the ages of 16–20 who live in economically deprived households. These services are provided by public and private community-based agencies which submit applications under a state grant competition. (STEP used to have a component for in-school youth as well as dropouts, but that has been discontinued.)

The program is designed to re-enroll dropouts and assist in their transition to the job market. STEP extends an employment guarantee to out-of-school youth to encourage them to obtain their General Education Diploma (GED) while working in subsidized jobs. As part of this bargain, participants sign a contract with the community-based agency agreeing to participate in an educational program with clearly defined objectives. Education services are provided directly by the community-based agency, which employs a certified teacher for this purpose. Firms receive a subsidy of up to 50 percent of wages for employing STEP participants.

All STEP providers must provide recruitment, pre-employment skills, counseling, job development, and tutoring or basic skills remediation. Grantees are also required to establish linkages with local departments of social services as well as community human service agencies and private sector employers.

For further information, contact: STEP Office, New York State Department of Labor, State Office Building Campus, Albany, New York 12240. Phone: (518) 457-0209.

NEW YORK SKILLS OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Following the recommendations in the *America's Choice* report, in April, 1991, Governor Mario Cuomo suggested legislation, which has not been enacted as of this writing, to create Skills Opportunity Centers (SOCs) across the state. SOCs would serve youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who have left school without earning a high school diploma.

The Centers would provide youth with access to a variety of services, including basic education, skills training, on-the-job training, employment and career counseling, work experience and internships, job placement and mentoring. The goal would be to assist each student in the attainment of a high school diploma and the skills needed to compete and succeed in the workplace.

SOCs would be operated by a policy board representing a variety of interests, with a majority from business and industry. A new state aid formula would fund these programs. In addition, for each dropout from their district who attends a SOC, school districts would lose an amount of state aid, thus creating a financial disincentive for districts that do not serve students in their regular programs. A bill authorizing the SOC program is currently pending in the Legislature.

For further information, contact: Richard Jones, Chief, Bureau of Occupational Education Program Development, New York State Education Department, Room 1623, One Commerce Plaza, Albany, NY 12234. Phone: (518) 474-4806.

NEW YORK CENTERS FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES (ACCESS)/ COUNSELING, ASSESSMENT AND SUPPORT SERVICES FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING (CASSET)

To help adults overcome personal barriers to participation in education and training programs (especially adults on public assistance), the New York State Education Department and the New York Department of Social Services initiated two programs in 1989.

The first initiative is a group of 14 Adult Centers for Comprehensive Education and Support Services (ACCESS) located in the state's largest counties. Each ACCESS Center offers assessment and counseling, case management services, literacy and basic education, English as a Second Language, GED preparation, child care, and occupational education, with referral to other provider agencies as needed.

The second initiative, called Counseling, Assessment and Support Services for Education and Training (CASSET), consists of 34 sites in both large and smaller counties where most of the same education and support services are provided, but not all at the same location, so there is a greater emphasis on referral to other agencies to meet client needs.

The ACCESS and CASSET initiatives have received about $5 million in state and federal program funds in each of the last two years. Program managers plan to expand the program to additional sites in the coming year.

For further information, contact: Iona Mirsky, ACCESS/CASSET Coordinator, New York State Education Department, Room 5D45, Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230. Phone: (518) 474-3973.

INNOVATIONS IN THE JOB CORPS

The federal Job Corps is widely regarded as a cost-effective success in training at-risk youth over its 27-year history. Annual federal appropriations now enjoy substantial bipartisan support. Bills are under consideration in the U.S. Congress that would expand the number of Job Corps sites and enrollment by 50 percent over five years—from 112 centers to 162 and from 42,000 training slots to 62,000.

We note Job Corps in this publication because a variety of innovative projects are underway to team Job Corps with other federal, state and local support services, and to pair Job Corps training with general education. Two examples:

—*The Miami Job Corps* and the *South Bronx* (New York City) *Job Corps*—both operated by ResCare, a private corporation—have become accredited as high schools, so that all non-high school graduates participating in the program can, at the same time, work toward their high school degrees.

—*Seattle, Washington* Mayor Norman Rice and his staff are working with an array of state and local agencies, Seattle's Private Industry Council, 14 community-based organizations, and the Cascades Job Corps Center to build a comprehensive urban Job Corps program to meet the needs of Seattle's most at-risk youth. Through this collaboration, the Job Corps is to provide a full range of educational services—including bilingual and vocational education and linkages with postsecondary programs—to program participants, as well as employment preparation, private sector internships, job transition assistance, housing, health care, child care and parenting education. City agencies, local employers, educational institutions, the juvenile justice system and community-based agencies hope to augment federal dollars with local support for the initiative.

For further information about the Job Corps, contact: Peter E. Rell, Director, Office of Job Corps, US Department of Labor, Third Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Room N-4508, Washington, DC 20210. Phone: (202) 535-0550 or Alan Zuckerman, Home Builders Institute, 15th and M Streets, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Phone: (202) 822-0494.

CHAPTER NINE: NEW PATHWAYS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The primary focus of this report has been on state and community efforts to create pathways to successful careers for those who enter the labor force directly after high school. Postsecondary education has been mentioned in connection with the role community colleges play in tech prep programs (Chapter Five); in relation to community service (Chapter Six); and as a setting where high school students may take some coursework (Chapter Three, the Wisconsin program).

Increasingly, however, success in the lower school grades is seen as inextricably related to the availability of opportunities for securing access to postsecondary education. Therefore, we note several initiatives beyond grades K-12.

The first are initiatives that offer the promise of financial help for postsecondary education to youth who are not otherwise likely to be college-bound, and also provide a variety of support services to help at-risk youth stay in high school and build a foundation for career success, whether they go on to college or not. These include *New York's Liberty Scholarships and Partnerships*, the *Rhode Island Children's Crusade*, the *Michigan Tuition Incentive Program* and similar programs in Louisiana and Maryland.

We also note the State of Washington's *Running Start* program, which utilizes community colleges in novel ways to provide educational services to both the college-bound and those not pursuing postsecondary education. Finally, other states—including Kansas and Washington—tie community service to student financial aid in the form of mentoring programs for at-risk students in elementary and secondary schools.

NEW YORK LIBERTY SCHOLARSHIPS AND LIBERTY PARTNERSHIPS

This legislation is based on the concept that more low-income students would stay in high school if they could be confident that they could receive *guaranteed* financial support to pursue postsecondary education, and if they received the right kind of counseling and support services to encourage successful high school completion.* In 1988, the Liberty Scholarship program was enacted to ensure that the necessary financial support would be forthcoming; the Liberty Partnership program was enacted to provide appropriate support services (New York State Education Law, Section 610).

Although implementation of Liberty Scholarships was delayed from its projected startup in the 1991-92 school year due to the state's budget crisis, Liberty Partnerships have been initiated. Governor Cuomo has recently reaffirmed his commitment to implement the Liberty Scholarship program as soon as finances permit.

The Liberty Scholarship program is designed to interlock with federal aid programs and the state's extensive Tuition Assistance Program. The Liberty Scholarship would pay non tuition costs of college attendance (such as books, supplies, transportation and living expenses) based on a formula offering full support for students from families with incomes of $18,000 or less, and aid on a descending scale as family income rises to about $30,000. Eligibility information would be made widely available to high school students.

The Liberty Partnership program offers grants to identify at-risk students and to develop assessment, tutoring, mentoring and other support initiatives to help them succeed in high school. Grants are to be phased in over a period of years on a population formula basis. During the current year, services at 53 centers are expected to serve 11,500 students.

Legislation was introduced in the 1991 session of the U.S. Congress by Rep. Nita Lowey (D-NY) (H.R. 2350) to provide federal matching funds to

*See the discussion of these concepts, and of "Fair Chance," in *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families*, Chapter 7, (Washington, DC: William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, 1988.)

help other states implement programs of this nature.

For further information, contact: Charles Treadwell, Program Research Specialist, NYS Higher Education Services Corporation, 99 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12255. Phone: (518) 474-1549.

RHODE ISLAND CHILDREN'S CRUSADE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The *Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education*, enacted in 1990 (General Laws of Rhode Island 16-70:1-5), is designed to provide academic and financial incentives for students to complete high school and go on to postsecondary education. Beginning in 1992, the program will be open to third-graders who qualify for free school lunches under federal guidelines. These children and their parents will sign a contract under which the student will promise to stay in school, stay off drugs, stay out of trouble with the law and not become a parent. Students will send their report cards to the Crusade for monitoring and participate in a mentoring program.

In return, beginning in 2001, the nonprofit Crusade Foundation established to administer the program will provide students with a full four-year scholarship at any of Rhode Island's public and independent institutions. The Foundation is currently in the process of raising a $10 million endowment. The state has contributed $3 million thus far and is expected to contribute an additional $1.5 million next year. The remaining funds will be raised from other public and private sources.

For further information, contact: Sylvia Robinson, Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education, 301 Promenade Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5089. Phone: (401) 277-6907.

MICHIGAN TUITION INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Since 1988, Michigan has made a commitment to provide free tuition at a local community college to youths from poor households who complete high school before the age of 20. About $2.5 million is currently appropriated for this purpose.

Seventh to twelfth graders from Medicaid-eligible families are eligible to apply for the tuition aid. Benefits may be drawn up to four and a half years following high school graduation. Students remain qualified even if their families are no longer Medicaid-eligible once the college benefits have begun.

Grant recipients who complete a two-year college program within four years qualify for an additional $2,000 from the state toward tuition at any public or private four-year college or university in Michigan. Finally, students who have no other health insurance may receive medical coverage from the state while they remain enrolled in college.

For further information, contact: Brian Stewart, Manager, Tuition Assistance Program, Michigan Department of Social Services, 235 South Grand Street, Suite 1318, Lansing, Michigan 48909. Phone: (800) 243-2847.

LOUISIANA COLLEGE TUITION ASSISTANCE PLAN

Under the *Louisiana College Tuition Assistance Plan*, enacted in 1989 (LRS 17:3026), the state covers the full cost of tuition at a Louisiana state college or university for any student who: (1) completes a college preparatory curriculum in high school with at least a 2.5 grade point average; (2) attains a score of at least 20 on the Enhanced Version of the American College Testing Program (ACT) entrance exam; (3) has no criminal record; and (4) comes from a family with an adjusted gross income of $25,000 or less. (The income cap increases by $5,000 for each additional child.) In the 1991-92 school year, $4 million in grants are being awarded to 1,100 students.

For further information, contact: Winona Walker Kahao, Director, Scholarships and Grants, Office of Student Financial Assistance, PO Box 91202, Baton Rouge, LA 70821-9202. Phone: (504) 922-1011.

MARYLAND EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AWARDS

In 1991, Maryland enacted the *Educational Excellence Awards Program* under which, beginning in 1995, scholarships will be awarded to students with family incomes below the poverty level who complete a college preparatory curriculum with a 2.5 grade point average. Supplementing federal grants, the program will cover virtually all educational costs for students at a two- or four-year public college or university in the state. (Grants may also be applied toward tuition at private colleges.) This program dovetails with Maryland's College Intervention Preparation Program, a three-year, $750,000 pilot program initiated in five regions in 1988 to provide academic and counseling support for students beginning in the middle school grades.

For further information, contact: Robin Radespiel, Maryland Higher Education Commission, 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, MD 21401. Phone: (301) 974-2971.

WASHINGTON RUNNING START PROGRAM

Washington's Running Start program was initiated in legislation signed by Governor Booth Gardner in April, 1990 (Second Substitute House Bill No. 2379.) The program provides new community college and vocational college options for high school students in the 11th and 12th grades and for high school dropouts.

For high school students: Under Running Start, students in the 11th and 12th grades may take courses for high school credit at any local community college or technical college in the state, if the coursework is accepted by the school district and the student is accepted at the college. In this respect, the Washington program resembles the postsecondary education section of Wisconsin's School to Work Initiative (Chapter Three). The school district pays the student's college tuition at a standard rate; no other tuition or fees can be assessed to the student. The student's transcript notes that the course was taken at a postsecondary institution.

In addition, any state institution may award postsecondary credit for college-level academic or technical courses successfully completed at the community or technical college by a high school student. Again, tuition is not charged to participating students. Since September, 1990, these programs for high school students have been implemented in five community college districts selected by the State Board of Education.

For high school dropouts: Under this program, high school dropouts *of any age* may take adult basic education courses or courses leading to the General Education Diploma at any community and technical college in the state. Tuition is free. The only caveat is that the school district in which the student is located must approve the student's participation.

For further information, contact: Patricia Green, Assistant Director, State Board for Community College Education, 319 7th Avenue, FF-11, Olympia, WA 98504. Phone: (206) 753-3662.

KANSAS YOUTH EDUCATION SERVICE PROGRAM

Beginning in 1988, the Kansas Legislature tied the concepts of mentoring and community service to that of student financial aid for postsecondary education. Under the Youth Education Service Program, college students mentor public school students in return for college aid stipends. The program was expanded in 1989.

For further information, contact: Representative Rick Bowden, Chair, Education Subcommittee, Kansas House of Representatives, State Capitol, 300 W. 10th Avenue, Topeka, KS 66612. Phone: (913) 296-7631.

WASHINGTON STATE COMMUNITY SERVICE INITIATIVES

Washington State's Legislature and its Higher Education Coordinating Board are also leaders in tying community service to student financial aid. Using the state's Work-Study program funds and federal State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) funds, the Board enables college students to serve their communities and, in return, earn money for postsecondary education.

For further information, contact: Betty Fallihee, Assistant Director for Student Financial Aid, Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board, 917 Lake Ridge Way, GV-11, Olympia, WA 98504. Phone: (206) 753-4592.

******

For additional information on campus-based community service, contact: Campus Compact, Box 1975, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912. Phone: (401) 863-1119.

Chapter Ten: Creative Funding Mechanisms for Human Investment

In recent years, a number of states have developed innovative mechanisms outside the general appropriations process to support activities related to education and training. Here we report briefly on four of them: The *California Employment Training Panel* is supported by a special tax of 0.1 percent of payroll in the state Unemployment Insurance system. The *Massachusetts Labor Shortage Initiative* utilizes a tax on hospital revenues to support education and training in the health care professions. The *Oregon Workforce Development Fund* uses monies dedicated from Oregon's state lottery to support workforce training activities. Florida's *Pinellas County Juvenile Welfare Board* uses a special levy to fund youth service programs.

Also, as noted in Chapter Four, the *Arkansas Youth Apprenticeship Program* is one of a number of educational initiatives supported by an Educational Excellence Trust Fund which, in turn, is funded by a dedicated 1/2 cent increase in the sales tax and application of that tax to the sale of used vehicles. The Arkansas Legislature also authorized a 1/2 cent increase in the corporate income tax to fund a major restructuring of vocational education programs.

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL

Originated in 1982 (and now authorized through January, 1994, under Chapter 926 of the 1989 California Statutes), the California Employment Training Panel (ETP) supports customized job training for displaced workers or workers faced with displacement, and helps firms avert layoffs and meet their need for skilled workers.

ETP is supported by a special tax of 0.1 percent of payroll on employers with a positive Unemployment Insurance tax rate, although only a portion of the funds generated by this tax go to the ETP through a line item appropriation. The amount now available is approximately $70 million.

ETP is an independent state agency comprised of seven business and labor representatives, three appointed by the Governor and two each by the Speaker of the Assembly and President Pro Tempore of the Senate. The Panel meets on a monthly basis to consider applications from employers, training agencies and consortia to fund training programs.

Manufacturing, retail and service industries are eligible for the program, the ETP providing funds for job training in a variety of occupations. All but $2.7 million of ETP funds (see below) may be used only to train workers eligible or potentially eligible for Unemployment Insurance. Projects must result in placement and retention of the worker in a job at a wage level specified under a performance-based contract. Where workers are unionized, the unions must be a party to the training agreement. In general, the affected business decides the proper training mode and must hire or retain workers successfully completing the training. Training can be provided by the employer's own in-house staff, or by community colleges, union trainers, or any other public or private provider.

In 1991, for the first time, $2.7 million of ETP funds are dedicated to projects in which the requirement is waived that trainees be eligible or potentially eligible for Unemployment Insurance.

For further information, contact: Ken Nather, The Employment Training Panel, Att: Planning and Information, P.O. Box 826880, MIC 64, Sacramento, CA 94280-0001. Phone: (916) 654-9072.

MASSACHUSETTS LABOR SHORTAGE INITIATIVE

The Massachussetts Department of Medical Security (DMS), under the authority of Section 83 of Chapter 23 of the Acts of 1988 (as amended), is responsible for developing and financing programs that address labor shortages facing hospitals. These programs are funded through an assessment on each acute care hospital equal to one-tenth of one

percent of the hospital's gross patient service revenues (GPSR).

The Department is authorized to fund programs to, among other things, train health care workers; develop career ladders for the health care professions; and provide child care opportunities and support at hospitals and other health care facilities. DMS solicits and evaluates Requests for Proposals (RFPs) periodically and collaborates with the Massachusetts Hospital Association (MHA) in the planning and implementation of the Labor Shortage Initiative (LSI).

Since the beginning of LSI in 1990, $8.9 million dollars has been awarded for 66 education and training programs, 10 child care, and 9 perinatal programs. These include education and training in allied health and nursing, recruitment, adult basic education and English as a Second Language. Programs are directed toward upgrading and training current workers, as well as attracting new workers. Bidders are expected to actively recruit low income persons, people of color, linguistic and cultural minorities, the physically challenged, welfare recipients, ex-offenders, older individuals, veterans and other under- and unemployed individuals into funded programs.

For further information, contact: Paula Smith, Department of Medical Security, 1 Ashburton Place, Eleventh Floor, Room 1105, Boston, MA 02108. Phone: (617) 727-8300.

OREGON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

Eight million dollars was dedicated in 1991 from Oregon's lottery funds (citation: HB 3474) to support 20 education, training and evaluation programs designed to improve the quality of Oregon's workforce. An additional $2.3 million was appropriated to support Oregon's 2 + 2 (tech prep) program.

These funds will be used to support activities:

—To raise educational standards (counseling; skills improvement; technology education and applied academics; business internships for instructors and counselors; a workplace readiness demonstration project; and teacher and counselor technical training);

—To improve learning environments (skills training centers);

—To upgrade professional and technical training (2 + 2 programs; structured work experience for students; student leadership skills; high school equipment; industry-sponsored math and science education) and to provide financial credits for student volunteers;

—To implement education reform (model school demonstration projects);

—To promote high performance work organizations (advanced technology center development; literacy hot line; self-sufficiency financial aid; targeted training; occupational program planning system; statewide worker skills assessment.)

For further information, contact: Thomas Lynch, Manager, LMI Programs, Oregon Employment Division, 875 Union Street, NE, Salem, OR 97310. Phone: (503) 378-8656.

PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA JUVENILE WELFARE BOARD

The result of a juvenile court judge's efforts to improve the county's severe shortage of children's and youth services, the Juvenile Welfare Board was established in 1945 as a special, independent taxing district of local government. A .4348 mil levy (about 44 cents per thousand dollars of assessed property value) collects nearly $8.5 million each year to finance children and youth services. The Board contracts with public and private voluntary youth agencies which provide services that must meet at least one measurable outcome objective and a specified degree of client satisfaction. Through a community planning process and seven Youth Services Advisory Committees, the Board identifies gaps in youth services and works to coordinate and expand existing services, as well as to fund new programs. In 1987, 37 different voluntary and public agencies, funded entirely or in part by the Juvenile Welfare Board, operated 67 programs serving children and parents in 22,000 families.

Functioning more like an independent, non-profit corporation than a governmental entity, the Board takes positions on public policy and advocates on behalf of youth. In addition to supporting a range of services, the Board funds on-going needs assessment and community planning efforts, technical assistance, training, and an audio-visual library focused on child and family issues.

Well-accepted by the community—84 percent of voters in a recent survey approved the Board's work—Juvenile Welfare Board funds support temporary placement for abused and neglected children; in-home respite care for families with children who have disabilities; shelters from domestic abuse;

group homes for adolescents; family reconciliation services; life-skills training; tutoring and counseling; and a variety of prevention and treatment programs providing comprehensive education, health, and support services. Pinellas Village, for example, based on a successful Denver, Colorado effort, provides housing and comprehensive family services to help single mothers break the cycle of poverty.

Coordination and comprehensive service delivery is one of the Board's primary goals. With 42 percent of its budget derived from the Juvenile Welfare Board, Alternative Human Services of Pinellas and Pasco Counties is able to offer a hot-line for teens and a "Parent Talk" line with 32 tapes on important youth issues. In 1987, the teen hot-line received more than 55,000 calls and was able to refer young people and their families to over 5,000 services from a data base of 600 agencies and 100 support groups in both counties.

In 1986, after the Florida Legislature voted to enable all counties to establish juvenile welfare boards, Palm Beach County established a similar taxing authority to support youth services.

For information contact: Kate Howze, Pinellas County Juvenile Welfare Board, 4140 49th Street, St. Petersburg, FL 33709. Phone: (813) 521-1853.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The material contained in this document was gathered primarily by Lawrence Gold and Samuel Halperin, with generous assistance from **Betsy Brown-Ruzzi** of the National Center for Education and the Economy and **Shirley Downs** of the National Governors' Association. Samuel Halperin was the chief editor, assisted by about 75 contributors who critiqued the manuscript in whole or in part.

The demanding task of synthesizing these examples of state and local policy initiatives was ably performed by Lawrence N. Gold. Most important, Larry added structure and coherence to what otherwise might have been a rambling series of unrelated policy ventures.

In addition to the persons mentioned by name in the previous pages, we acknowledge with appreciation the cooperation of: Paul Barton, Betsy Brand, Charles Bruner, Barbara Dyer, Frederick Edelstein, George Elford, Evelyn Ganzglass, David Hornbeck, Kenneth Hoyt, Richard Kazis, P. Alistair MacKinnon, Jim McKenney, Patricia McNeil, Frank Mensel, Jack Meyer, Ken Nelson, Tom Owens, Hilary Pennington, John Rankin, Phillip Rockefeller, James Rosenbaum, Norma Runner, Charles Saunders, Laurence Steinberg, Susan Stroud, Janet Topolsky, Robin Vink, Donna Walker, Laina Warsavage, Bob Watrus and Joan Wills.

Essential help in producing the report was contributed by Atelia Melaville, Tasha Harris, and Sue Gibbons.